



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 2007

No. 106

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 28, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BETTY MCCOLLUM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House or Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Reverend Erin Conaway, South Main Baptist Church, Houston, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Holy and merciful God, we come before You this morning, taking time to breathe in the grace and the bountiful love You lavish upon us through so many avenues we take for granted: the lilting of a bird's song, the array of colors from every budding bloom, the unadulterated joy of a child dancing, and, in this place, the trust of a Nation, constituents across the country who find hope in the representation they have in this Chamber, and the empowerment their hope gives to our Representatives to fulfill the call You, O God, have placed upon their lives.

Give us ears to hear, eyes to see, and hearts to feel Your loving presence and guidance as we courageously work to serve others.

Lord, you are the giver of dreams, and the author of real hope. In this quiet moment, we pray for a raucous peace to comfort us enough to listen and move us enough to dream, that dream that seems impossible and out of reach so that when we open our eyes and realize the dream is here, it will be to Your glory.

Help us to be agents of peace and empowerment, justice and mercy, freedom and dreams, for we pray in Your name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CONAWAY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1612) entitled "An Act to amend the penalty provisions in the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, and for other purposes.", and that upon the compliance of the request, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make corrections in the engrossment of the aforesaid bill.

### WELCOMING REVEREND ERIN CONAWAY

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, as a parent, there is no greater pride than the pride felt watching your children grow from being infants to being responsible adults. Suzanne and I are blessed to have four grown children who have grown into wonderful, responsible adults, and, in the case of three of them, seeing them become terrific parents themselves.

While I would like to brag about all four of our children, today's event dictates that I am limited to bragging on the young man who just delivered the morning's opening prayer. That young man is our son, Erin, who is associate pastor at South Main Baptist Church in Houston, Texas. He is a graduate of Baylor University with a fine arts degree and a graduate of Truitt Seminary at Baylor University with a master of divinity degree.

More importantly, he is a man of deep faith in Jesus Christ as his personal savior. He is also the husband of Carmen Brassfield Conaway and father to daughter Alexandra and son Samuel.

In addition to being a wonderful son, husband and father, Erin is also a gifted writer and pastor. Our family was recently blessed when Erin performed the memorial services for my dad, his grandfather.

Suzanne and I are always proud of your accomplishments, but today we are particularly proud of seeing you opening this session of Congress and look forward to your bright future.

We love you.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7343

## PREPARE ALL KIDS ACT OF 2007

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this week I introduce the House companion to Senator CASEY's Prepare All Kids Act of 2007. This bill is designed to help States expand their pre-K programs and child care services.

As this chart shows, we get the biggest bang for our education dollars by investing in our children before they even go to school. Estimates show that the return on investing in early care in education is between 17 to 18 percent annually. If this were a stock, all of Wall Street would be buying it.

The legislation is very helpful to the children we represent in our States. For example, more than one-quarter of a million 4-year-olds in New York State would be eligible for the programs created in this bill, including 100,000 children who would qualify for free pre-K. The future prosperity of our Nation rests on setting our children on a path for success early in life.

HONORING OUR TROOPS THIS  
FOURTH OF JULY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, as we approach the Fourth of July, I want to thank our troops in Iraq, Afghanistan and across the world. It is because of their service that we are able to celebrate our freedom.

In my seven visits to Iraq and three to Afghanistan, I have seen firsthand the new greatest generation. Our coalition forces are stopping the terrorists overseas to protect American families at home. Osama bin Laden's right-hand man and al Qaeda spokesman Zawahiri has proclaimed that Iraq and Afghanistan are the central fronts in the global war on terrorism.

I look forward to honoring the sacrifices of our troops this Fourth of July weekend at the Celebration of Liberty service with Pastor Wendell Estep of First Baptist Church in Columbia.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th.

GENERAL PETRAEUS ADMITS  
THAT CONDITIONS WILL NOT IMPROVE  
IN IRAQ BY SEPTEMBER

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, conditions on the ground in Iraq are not getting any better. In fact, things are getting worse.

During a 48-hour period last week, 14 of our soldiers were killed, and then over the weekend another eight were

killed in one day. April and May were two of the most violent months for our troops since the beginning of the war. It is clear the President's troop surge or escalation plan is not working. In fact, last week General David Petraeus acknowledged there would not be any significant improvements in Iraq by September.

Why is that significant? Because that's when President Bush said we would be able to see if the plan was working. The fact is we won't know in September because it's not working, according to the President's own general.

Then this week, two respected Republican Senators, Senator LUGAR and Senator VOINOVICH, said the current policy is not working and a significant change is needed. The comments of these Senators, coupled with those of General Petraeus, should serve as a wake-up call to congressional Republicans. Join us in ending this war, bringing our troops home, and saving America's face.

DEMOCRATS PROMISED NOT TO  
HOLD RECORDED VOTES OPEN

(Mr. WICKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WICKER. Madam Speaker, less than 6 months ago, House Democrats promised not to hold recorded votes open to change the results. They went even further. They changed the House rules to prohibit this practice. But last night the Chair held a 2-minute vote open so that five Democrat Members could have their arms twisted, change their votes and pass the Udall amendment.

And what was this amendment? Democrats broke their promise for a provision that prohibits America from producing energy from our plentiful supply of shale, further demonstrating what a fraud the Democrats' energy policy is, a policy repeatedly preventing us from developing our own petroleum reserves.

Shame on the Democratic leadership for going back on their promise with such breathtaking speed. More importantly, shame on the Democrats for a policy that stops Americans from producing our own energy, for causing gasoline prices to continue to rise, and for making sure we are increasingly dependent on foreign oil.

VICE PRESIDENT CAN'T HAVE IT  
BOTH WAYS WHEN IT COMES TO  
HIM BEING A MEMBER OF THE  
EXECUTIVE BRANCH

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, for the last 7 years, Vice President CHENEY has perfected the art of meaningful oversight and avoiding any accountability to the American people. But who would

have ever thought that such a defiance would lead the Vice President to the absurd, claiming that he is not a member of the executive branch. That's right, Cheney does not want to play by the established rules of safeguarding classified national information. He is now saying that he is not actually a member of the executive branch.

If the Vice President is not a member of the executive branch, shouldn't he be forced to turn over information to the congressional Democrats requested regarding his secret energy task force? After all, CHENEY used executive privilege as an excuse for his secrecy.

Also, why should the office of the Vice President receive funding through the bill that funds the executive branch? That bill is actually on the floor today, and the House Democrats will offer an amendment to remove funding for the Vice President's office from this bill. House Democrats are not going to support the Vice President's latest attempt to avoid any accountability to the American people.

## HONORING JIM NUSSLE

(Mr. MCCRERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, today, a good man and former chairman of the House Budget Committee will be honored by his colleagues. A portrait of Jim Nussle will be unveiled and displayed in the committee room where he held the gavel for 6 years.

Jim Nussle is a passionate man. He strongly believes that we are sent to Washington to be good stewards for taxpayers, and he was one of their best advocates. Under Jim's leadership of the Budget Committee, and for the first time in nearly a decade, we took a first step in reforming our mandatory, or entitlement, spending, the largest and least sustainable part of our budget, saving taxpayers nearly \$40 billion over the next years.

Jim also worked to reform the budget process itself and reached across the aisle to develop a bipartisan solution. He coauthored the Comprehensive Budget Process Reform Act in 1988 with Representative BEN CARDIN. He has also supported the legislative line item veto and earmark reform.

Given his experience, knowledge and commitment to public service, it is fitting that the President has selected Jim as his nominee for Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

VICE PRESIDENT HAS A PROBLEM  
OF FIGURING OUT WHICH  
BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT HE  
BELONGS TO

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, we need a history lesson right here.

Article II, the executive powers shall be vested in the powers of the President of the United States. He shall hold

his office for a term of 4 years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term.

The Vice President has a problem of figuring out which branch of government he belongs to. But in Federalist Paper No. 68, Alexander Hamilton was very, very clear about this. The appointment of an extraordinary person as Vice President has been objected to as superfluous. Take the Senator of any State from his seat as a Senator to place him in the President of the Senate would be totally ridiculous, would be to exchange a regard to the State from which he came a constant for a contingent vote.

The other consideration is that as the Vice President may occasionally become a substitute for the President, in the supreme executive magistracy, all the reasons which recommend the mode of elections prescribed for the one apply for the great, if not with equal force, to the manner of appointing the other. It is remarkable that this, as in most other instances, with the objection which is made, would be against the Constitution of this State.

Mr. Vice President, go back to the Constitution and learn where you belong.

□ 1015

#### CONGRATULATING FORMER CONGRESSMAN JIM NUSSLE

(Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the Speaker for the opportunity to speak this morning.

I want to congratulate my good friend, former colleague from Iowa, Jim Nussle, on the unveiling of his portrait today and I would encourage all of his former colleagues to attend that ceremony at 4 o'clock this afternoon in 210 in the Cannon House Office Building.

Jim Nussle was a tireless advocate for the future of this country, and through the Budget Committee that he chaired for 6 years, did an outstanding job of fighting for the next generation to understand that the entitlement programs that are going to really cause devastation in our budgets in the future should be addressed, and fought tirelessly for the next generation.

As we all know, Jim Nussle has been nominated to be the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. There is no one better qualified than Jim Nussle, that has the skill to do this job, that has the budget knowledge. Jim Nussle is the most knowledgeable person we could possibly have in that position. He'll be a tireless advocate for a balanced budget, someone that can work across the aisle, as he did on the Budget Committee. And the comments from the ranking member last year really indicate how well Jim Nussle will work for our country and to lead our Nation and to manage this enormous government that we have.

So let's commend Jim Nussle, show up for the unveiling and really be advocates for him to continue his service for the country.

#### BRAVE ACT

(Mr. SARBANES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to salute our men and women in uniform. Every year at this time we gather with our friends and family to celebrate Independence Day and the freedoms we hold dear.

But this year, and every year, when families are missing the presence of a spouse, parent or child or worse, mourning the loss of a loved one, we must also pause to remember the sacrifice of our veterans. That's why I'm introducing the Benefit Rating Acceleration for Veteran Entitlements Act, or BRAVE Act, which would make it easier for our most disabled veterans to obtain their benefits.

That's why I'm working with others to initiate a national conversation on how veterans can participate in service corps programs and how those programs can serve our veterans.

Madam Speaker, on the Fourth of July, when we celebrate liberty, we must give special recognition and honor to those who are doing so much and have done so much to protect our freedoms.

#### DEMOCRATS ARE MAKING A BAD SITUATION WORSE

(Mr. AKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, there once was an incompetent pharmacist who administered too much medicine and thereby made a bad situation worse, and the patient died.

The Democrats are like the incompetent pharmacist. They recognize that gas prices are too high and they recognize it's bad for us to be dependent on foreign oil. So the Democrats have voted to administer a dose of their favorite medicine, tax increases. They plan to increase taxes on American oil and gas. But the oil companies will simply raise the price of gasoline. In addition, by making American oil more expensive, it will further make us dependent on Middle Eastern oil.

The Democrats should look at drilling for American oil and liquefying coal, two things that they have opposed in the past. The Democrats are writing the wrong prescription and they make a bad situation worse. I just hope the patient doesn't die.

#### WE MUST END THE WAR IN IRAQ NOW

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to others who are calling for an end to the war in Iraq. We must end this war and we must end it now. We cannot wait, and we must not wait.

Every month, every week, every day, every hour, every minute, every second, every moment that another young man OR another young woman is killed, their innocent blood is on all of our hands. We have a moral obligation, a mission and a mandate to bring this madness to an end.

Nothing, but nothing good can come out of this war. It is destroying Iraq and destroying the very soul of our Nation.

As Members of Congress, we must find a way to stop it and stop it now.

#### FREE SPEECH VS. FAIR SPEECH

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the unfair "Broadcast Fairness Doctrine" has reappeared. It is an attempt by the feds to force radio stations to be fair and balanced by forcing broadcasters to air opposing views of public importance. Sounds good, but who's going to determine what fair is, the Federal fair police?

Are we going to let a bunch of Potomac River bureaucrats determine if a radio station in Tomball, Texas is being fair when it discusses politics? Sounds like government control of speech to me. And fair means different things to different folks. It's too subjective a word for us to even agree on.

The Fairness Doctrine would not even promote public discourse. It would, in fact, force radio broadcasters to do away with controversy and maybe go to airing 24-hour music like Willie Nelson's greatest hits. Oops. Someone here might say Willie's not fair and balanced.

Anyway, the Constitution is clear. Congress, that's us, shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. You notice, it doesn't guarantee fair speech.

Our forefathers wrote that first amendment to prevent government control of our free speech. So this Fairness Doctrine is neither fair speech, free speech or constitutional speech.

And that's just the way it is.

#### HOUSE DEMOCRATS MAKING PROGRESS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, since I've been here in Washington, in January, this Congress, under strong Democratic leadership, is making progress on the American people's priorities, despite intense opposition on many issues.

In spite of this opposition, Democrats have succeeded by increasing pay for 13

million workers, raising the minimum wage for the first time in a decade, by providing overdue assistance to the gulf region hit hard by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, by protecting our troops, investing in military readiness, including armed vehicles and equipment, and by increasing the transparency and accountability with strengthened ethics and lobbying rules.

We also continue moving legislation that has already passed here in the House but is making its way through the system, including fully implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, putting 50,000 more police officers on our streets, and by providing the largest increase in veterans health care funding in the Veterans Administration's 77-year history.

Madam Speaker, this new Democratic Congress has begun moving our Nation in a new direction to address the needs of all Americans.

#### IRAN IS RUNNING OUT OF GASOLINE

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Last night Iranian citizens burned gas stations in Iran, protesting President Ahmadinejad's gasoline rationing plan. Yes, Iran is running out of gasoline. Despite being a leading OPEC oil producer, Iran is heavily dependent on gasoline from abroad. This is the key weakness of Iran.

The Iranian government has promised to attack Israel. It is the chief funder of Hezbollah and Hamas. It threw U.N. inspectors out, and says that it is enriching uranium.

Last night Congressman ROB ANDREWS and I introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 2880, calling for more gasoline restrictions on Iran. After last night's gasoline riots, a policy of the U.S., working with our allies, could become the diplomatic key to bring pressure on Iran to stop funding terror and building nuclear weapons.

Running out of gasoline. This is a danger for Iran's rulers and an opportunity for our diplomats.

#### VICE PRESIDENT CHENEY'S EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Vice President CHENEY, in his usual arrogant way, refused to disclose the deliberations of his secret energy task force that gave billions to big oil and increased our dependence on OPEC. He claimed executive privilege.

Then his office illegally disclosed the identity of a secret undercover CIA officer, Valerie Plame. They claimed executive privilege.

Now, we find that the Vice President is mishandling classified information

in volumes in violation of Executive Branch regulations. And we have the astonishing assertion that the Vice President is not part of the executive branch. Rip up those civics text books kids. DICK CHENEY is above the law and the Constitution of the United States, according to his attorney. Or perhaps he's just that higher power that George Bush refers to every time he has to make a difficult decision like launching an unneeded war in Iraq.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that they should not engage in personalities toward the Vice President of the United States.

#### NON-FAIRNESS DOCTRINE

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, freedom is the foundational principle of our society. Our founders were champions of this God-given right and charged future generations with eternal vigilance to protect it.

Now, a handful of people in Washington want Uncle Sam to start telling radio and TV personalities what to talk about, to limit their freedom and ours.

Rather than fight in the marketplace of ideas, they want to bring back a 1929 radio regulation rule known as the "Fairness Doctrine." Now, don't be fooled. There's nothing fair about it.

In the early age of broadcasting, when the majority of news and information was distributed by one or two outlets, it seemed important to promote a competition of viewpoints. That was then.

A fairness doctrine today tramples upon freedom of speech and freedom of the press. It dictates to Americans that in an open, free and flooded marketplace of ideas, they need Washington politicians to sort it all out.

Madam Speaker, real freedom means a government that listens to the people, not one that dictates to the people who they must listen to.

Let's keep the Fairness Doctrine off our airwaves and in the history books where it belongs.

#### HOW MANY BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT ARE THERE

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, there's an easy civics pop quiz for the summer break. How many branches of government are there in the United States?

Well, any high school civics student can tell you that there are three. But

it seems like our Vice President is confused about the facts. House investigators have revealed that since 2003, the Vice President's office has failed to provide data on its classification activities as required under an executive order claiming that the Vice President's office is not, "an entity within the executive branch."

It seems that the Vice President's office believes that his office is its own branch of government above the law.

Madam Speaker, in light of this confusion, perhaps the President will see fit to give the Vice President some time off to improve his understanding of civics in the United States.

#### HONORING ARMY SERGEANT CHRIS DAVIS

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, this morning I come to the floor of this House to honor Army Sergeant Chris Davis. Sergeant Davis died Saturday defending liberty in Iraq. Serving in the United States Army was a life-long dream for Sergeant Davis. His 8 years in the Army included four tours of duty in Iraq. His devotion to America's security earned him numerous medals for his achievement, service and defense of his country.

A native of Lubbock, Texas, Chris was a brave soldier, a devoted husband and a loving father. This morning, my thoughts and prayers go out to his family: His parents, Ray and Hermina, his three sisters, his wife, Debbie, the children, Kasey, Blade, Jacob, Taylor and Dillon.

As we celebrate this Fourth of July week, may we remember the sacrifices of many that have gone before us and particularly this young brave soldier, Sergeant Davis from Lubbock, Texas.

#### HOUSE DEMOCRATS ARE MAKING PROGRESS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, for 6 months, Democrats have succeeded in changing the direction of this country. We have replaced Republican rubber stamps with meaningful Congressional oversight.

The Democratic House has now passed 50 key measures since January, most with strong bipartisan support. Thanks to this Democratic Congress, millions of Americans will receive their first pay raise in almost a decade on January 24. As a senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I was proud to support the long overdue increase in the minimum wage.

Gulf coast hurricane communities will get much needed relief, up-armed Humvees and critical military

support are getting to our troops, and fiscal responsibility has been restored to the Federal budget after the White House and Republican-led Congress reversed President Clinton's budget surplus and replaced it with the biggest budget deficit in American history.

This is only the beginning. This House has also passed legislation that will better protect our Nation by fully implementing the recommendations of the nonpartisan 9/11 Commission. Let's continue to move forward in this positive direction.

□ 1030

#### KOREAN WAR BILL CHARTER

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, this past Monday on the 57th anniversary of the start of the Korean War, Majority Leader STENY HOYER and I introduced legislation to right-fully honor Korean War veterans with a national charter. The charter pays no money but gives veterans leverage when dealing with the VA.

It is about time those who served in the Korean War enjoy the same mark of distinction and national recognition as those who came home from World War II. Some have dubbed the Korean War the "forgotten war" or even "the war that America forgot to remember."

You know, I was in that war, and so were at least two of our colleagues, CHARLIE RANGEL and JOHN CONYERS, and I think that it is kind of ridiculous that we haven't given them the recognition they deserve. I flew over 62 combat missions in Korea, and I can't think of a better way to honor our patriots who served in Korea.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor our bill, H.R. 2852, to give the Korean War Veterans Association a national charter.

#### FIRST HIGHER EDUCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2007

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1704) to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1704

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "First Higher Education Extension Act of 2007".

#### SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.

Section 2(a) of the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-81; 20 U.S.C. 1001 note) is amended by striking "June 30, 2007" and inserting "July 31, 2007".

#### SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or in the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 as amended by this Act, shall be construed to limit or otherwise alter the authorizations of appropriations for, or the durations of, programs contained in the amendments made by the Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-171) to the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Taxpayer-Teacher Protection Act of 2004.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 517 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2829.

□ 1034

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 146, line 22.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN OF KANSAS

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

Page 146, insert the following after line 22:

#### TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer, implement, or enforce the amendment made to section 515.533 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, that was published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2005.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment today that

I would like the Committee to consider, which is a prohibition against the expenditure of funds.

In the year 2000, this Congress passed legislation that altered our trading relationship with Cuba. That legislation, the Trade Sanctions Reform Act of 2000, was put in place that would allow for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, and medicine to Cuba for cash in advance. That legislation was signed into law and was operational; and from that period of time, we have sold nearly \$1.5 billion of agriculture commodities, food, and medicine to Cuba for cash in advance.

In the year 2005, the administration published a final rule clarifying the definition of cash payments in advance; and by that rule, it disrupted the sale of agriculture commodities, food, and medicine to Cuba. The change being that rather than payments in advance at the time the goods were delivered, the commodities were delivered in Cuba, the administration's rule requires that the payment be made before the commodities leave a United States port, a matter of days or weeks by advancing the payment.

This is contrary to our normal trading relationships, the norms within the international community, and has been disruptive and is an indication of our unwillingness to be a reliable provider of agriculture commodities to Cuba.

This amendment that I offer today prohibits the funding of the implementation or the enforcement of that rule promulgated by the administration in the year 2005, and so it would return us to the days following the passage of the original legislation, the Trade Sanctions Reform Act of 2000, that would once again say that cash in advance is payment when the commodity arrives in port in Cuba. And this change in rules has had an effect upon our ability of American farmers and agriculture producers to supply, to sell, for cash the things we produce in this country, a detrimental effect upon the farm economy. It is estimated that exports fell approximately 10 percent in value from 2004 to 2005. Wheat, which is important in my home State of Kansas, was decreased by 18 percent; rice by 38 percent; cotton by 87 percent; lumber by 100 percent; dairy products by 55 percent; seafood by 100 percent; course grains by 74 percent; and poultry decreased by 27 percent. And the goal is to try to restore those markets, once again be a more reliable supplier of food to the Cuban people, and to make certain that American agriculture is not harmed by our policy or is harmed less by our policy.

These are unilateral sanctions, Mr. Chairman, as you know. And unilateral sanctions are probably not effective in and of themselves when it is only the United States that fails to trade with Cuba. So, again, a rather modest modification in our policy, changing it to the days of the policies enacted by Congress before the administration changed the rules.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, this OFAC, Office of Foreign Assets Control, regulation clarifying the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, this regulation that the amendment before us seeks to prohibit enforcement of, stemmed from requests by U.S. financial institutions that were becoming concerned by the increasingly slow rate of payment for agricultural sales by the Cuban regime. The financial institutions requested OFAC to clarify the legislative intent of cash in advance, which is in the law, in order to protect the interests of those financial institutions on their claims.

The Cuban regime's entity in charge of agricultural purchases has an abysmal record of not paying its creditors and has been known to extort or seek to extort agricultural associations in order to increase the regime's lobbying pressure in favor of the unconditional lifting of sanctions, which is sought by the regime. The regime promises more agriculture purchases if agriculture interests lobby Congress for what the regime seeks, an end to sanctions. In effect, the opening of mass U.S. tourism and trade finance.

Currently, Mr. Chairman, the Cuban regime's foreign debt represents close to 800 percent of its GDP, and it is ranked by international credit agencies as the second worst, if not the worst, credit risk in the world. Countries throughout the world are taking extreme measures to obtain restitution for billions of dollars they are owed, which the Cuban regime refuses to pay.

In one example, a 15,000-ton Cuban regime-owned ship was held in the port of Conakry in Guinea, while a Canadian company armed with legal judgments pursued partial payment for the Cuban Government's defaulted debt.

And those are the types of actions, Mr. Chairman, that U.S. companies and ultimately U.S. taxpayers would inevitably have to resort to if Congress were to authorize credit for sales to the Cuban regime. The Congress, Mr. Chairman, must not allow the American taxpayer to become another victim of the Cuban regime's nonpayment to its creditors.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, again I would point out that this amendment today does not change the law and that all sales to Cuba must be for cash in advance. There is no agricultural credit through the United States Government that can be offered to Cuba to assist in the sale of purchases by Cuba nor can any U.S. financial institution be engaged in the ac-

tivity leading up to the sale of these commodities to Cuba.

So we do not change the law. It is simply a matter of definition. And at least in my estimation, the definition was changed for purposes of making those sales less likely to Cuba, thereby harming farmers, ranchers, and producers across the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my friend from Kansas if he has any further speakers.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I have no further speakers.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment. And under different circumstances, I would simply say I accept it and that would be the end of it, but that is not going to be the end of it.

I rise in support because I think there are a couple of things we have to know and we have to remember. First of all, there is a law in place since 2000, the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act, which allowed agricultural products to be sold to Cuba.

Now, here is where the irony comes in. In 2005 the Treasury Department issued regulations requiring that the payments for exports to Cuba must be either received by the U.S. exporter or by a third-country bank prior to the goods leaving the port in the United States rather than upon arrival in Cuba. Now, that is the only country we do that with.

Now, what is the irony here? The part of the argument that has always been made is that we should work in this Congress to help or to force Cuba into a political change, a political change which would mirror our democratic system, our electoral process, and also, I am sure, our capitalist system. Well, the irony of this is that it is capitalism at its best to allow credit to take place between two nations. It is anti-capitalism to suggest that the only way that we can sell products to you is if you pay ahead of time prior to looking at the product. I mean, we wouldn't do that. Picture going into a store and their saying you can't look at the product, you can't test the product, you can't do anything: you have to pay ahead of time.

□ 1045

So there is a contradiction here that doesn't make sense. What the gentleman wants to do is simply put Cuba on par with every other country.

Now, if we were here for the first time, as we were in 2000, creating a new way to trade with Cuba, then all these arguments, I think, would be in place, whether we want to do that or not, what kind of government they have. But we already have that in place. We already have that in place. And we should note that the reason we have

this in place is not because anti-embargo people like me ruled the day in 2000, it's because farmers in this country and business people in this country, but especially the farming community, felt that it was important for American business to be able to sell some products to Cuba. That has not changed our political stance on Cuba. Cuba still has an embargo imposed by the U.S. We still do not have relations with Cuba. Nothing has really changed since 2000 except the ability to sell products.

Now the gentleman wants to put Cuba on an even keel with the rest of the world. I think it's a proper way to go. I think it's good for our business community. I think it's good for trade with Cuba. And I support the gentleman's amendment.

I will be asking Members on this side and on both sides to vote for his amendment if it comes to a vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I would ask the gentleman from Florida if he has additional speakers or wishes to allow me to close.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would inquire of the chairman as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kansas has 45 seconds.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would simply reiterate that this clarifying regulation by OFAC stems from concerns and requests of U.S. financial institutions that were concerned because of a pattern they were noticing of delays in payment. So this regulation is precisely to carry out the legislation and implement the legislation of the year 2000 as, again, is a consequence and pursuant to the request of U.S. financial institutions that sought protection, and through clarification.

So with that in mind, I oppose the amendment by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 45 seconds.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your courtesies.

Again, I would ask for adoption of this amendment. I offered the amendment on the House floor in July of 2000 that ultimately resulted in the passage of the Trade Sanctions Reform Act.

I admit that I came here in support of farmers in Kansas who thought it was useful to them and beneficial to them economically to be able to sell to Cuba. And over time, I have tried to examine this issue, and it has become something broader. I think there is a greater benefit in the efforts to change the nature of Cuba and to enhance the opportunities that Cubans have for greater personal freedom by an economic relationship between our two countries.

And so, although it was initially an economic issue with me and it remains important to the agriculture community, I think it also benefits the opportunity that we can enhance Cubans for greater freedom and personal liberty within their own country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 34 offered by Mr. LUCAS:  
At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the United States Government to seize or otherwise take possession of, other than for value given in a sale or exchange, any coin, medal or numismatic item made or issued by the United States Government before January 1, 1933, that, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, is not already in the possession of the United States Government.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am introducing this amendment in an effort to provide legal certainty for coin collectors who own certain coinage minted before January 1, 1933.

My amendment would prohibit funds in the bill from being used to seize or take possession of any coin, medal or numismatic item made or issued by the United States Mint before January 1, 1933, that is not already in the possession of the United States Government.

Under current law, the Mint has the authority to seize coins created during this period if it believes that they are unauthorized coins. These unauthorized coins were never properly issued, but were created by people at the Mint or working with the Mint more than 75 years ago.

A classic example is the case of the 1913 Liberty Head nickels. And now these items are a part of our numismatic heritage. These coins have likely been publicly bought and sold several times over without the Mint ever attempting to confiscate them.

My amendment seeks, therefore, to provide legal certainty for coin collectors that they may buy, own or sell

these coins without the threat of government seizure. Again, this amendment will only apply to any coin, medal or numismatic item made or issued before January 1, 1933.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. And that states, "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." And it does impose additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I would just simply like to note that in the way this amendment is constructed, it would not require the additional expenditure funds, I believe. I believe in the way that it is crafted, it simply would prevent the Federal Government from using existing funds to take an action against numismatic collectors who have these pre-1933 items. And I believe this is crafted well within the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by all entities funded in the bill, namely, the date of issuance of certain items before taking possession of them. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. FLAKE:  
At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX

##### ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Small Business Administration may be used for the Grace Johnstown Area Regional Industries Incubator and Workforce Development program.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity we have. For a while it looked like we might not have this opportunity, so I do appreciate being able to challenge these earmarks on the House floor.

As rank-and-file Members, we are able to see certification letters that have been submitted by the requesting Member to the Appropriations Committee. I should point out again, as I did yesterday, we were unable to see

the actual request letter, so there is limited information that we have available on these earmarks and what they're for, but there are some that we're able to glean.

Let me just talk about this one a little. This one I actually challenged last year. That's part of the reason I'm coming again is this seems to be an earmark that just keeps coming up again and again for an organization that seems to exist only on earmarks.

This particular amendment would prohibit funding for the Johnstown Area Regional Industries, or JARI, Incubator and Workforce Development Program. Now, I don't know the specifics of the history of JARI, how it was started, I do know, however, that it has received several earmarks over the years.

I also know, among other things, JARI helps companies obtain government funding. Its Web site says, "JARI's Procurement Technical Assistance Center provides an array of services to assist companies in securing Federal, State and local government contracts and subcontracts."

So, in essence, what we're doing is sending Federal money to an organization, who then turns around with that money and seeks additional Federal money. I'm just wondering where this stops. How many of these organizations can we fund?

This is not the only organization of its kind, and that's partly what worries me here. We're finding dozens and dozens of organizations like this increasingly over the past couple of years that have been organized and created to secure additional Federal funding. These are earmarks that beget earmarks. These are earmarks incubators. And I don't know how much we can stand of this because the more we have out there, the more it seems to simply spawn other earmarks.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman starts off as we suspected by assuming that Members of Congress have no ability and no understanding and no knowledge, enough certainly to make an appropriation called an earmark. That assumes that only Federal agencies and the folks who work in those agencies know what a good program is.

I think every so often we have to remind ourselves what a so-called earmark is. An earmark is when a Member of Congress determines that in his or her district there is a program worthy of Federal support. But on so many occasions, as certainly has been the occasion in my district in the Bronx, those Federal agencies, for one reason or another, don't pay the attention they should, so a Member gets involved in directing some dollars. And it is some dollars compared to the total budget.



In this particular case, we're talking about an organization in the Youngstown area that was originally set up to deal with the fact that in the southwestern Pennsylvania region, there has been a mass exodus of people between 25 and 30 years of age. Furthermore, with the demise of the steel and coal industry, the region has seen very high levels of unemployment. New and small businesses are necessary to the economic well-being of the citizens of this area.

Now, JARI's efforts have directly led to an increase in small businesses formed in the region and jobs created and retained in the region. There has been an increase in longevity and sustainable efforts for small businesses. Business folks have been given the ability to grow. And yes, while the gentleman seems to think that it is a bad thing to have Federal dollars go in and then assist in reaching other dollars, well, that just shows that they know how to work the system and work it properly. There is nothing wrong with that. But the whole notion that only people and Federal agencies know how to direct dollars, and that only they know what a good program is is really a misconception.

Now, the gentleman from Arizona will be here for quite a while, we see he's setting up his presentation. And it will be a good, strong presentation, but it is only based on the belief that Members of Congress are not intelligent enough to know a good program, to know a good use of Federal dollars.

Interestingly enough, the same folks who will get up today and attack earmarks will not attack the fact that there are large number of earmarks that come directly out of the White House directing Congress to spend money on something; and that most have voted for the largest earmark of them all, the war in Iraq, which has earmarked hundreds of billions of dollars with very little, incidentally, accountability in many, many cases.

So, I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. He knows that he and I have a friendship, a personal friendship and respect. But on this one, as last time, he is totally wrong. I stand in opposition to his amendment and in support of this particular earmark.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1100

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I always enjoy debating my good friend from New York. My good friend from New York made a point when I challenged one of his earmarks last year that his district has one of the highest poverty rates, or it is number one in the country.

Here I have a map. The red areas show those counties in the country that have experienced persistent poverty over the past 30 years. I should note that virtually all of the earmarks I will be challenging today are not in

areas that are covered in the red, certainly not the one in western Pennsylvania today. This is not an area of persistent poverty. This is not an area where we are going in and helping the truly less fortunate.

The gentleman is correct that Members of Congress are, by and large, intelligent. They know how to work the system. I would submit that that is exactly what this is about. When you get an earmark that begets other earmarks, when you are funding organizations set up with the express purpose of getting other Federal moneys or other earmarks, there is something wrong with that picture. There is something wrong with that. Where does that end? That is simply not right.

I would ask the gentleman, this is not the gentleman's earmark. Is the sponsor of the earmark not here to defend the earmark today?

Mr. SERRANO. I am sorry?

Mr. FLAKE. The sponsor of the earmark is not here to defend the earmark today?

Mr. SERRANO. The sponsor is not on the floor, but his trusted companion is on the floor.

Mr. FLAKE. That sponsor is Mr. MURTHA?

Mr. SERRANO. You have said that.

Mr. FLAKE. According to the certification letter released, it is Mr. MURTHA of Pennsylvania. As I mentioned, this is the second year that I have challenged the same earmark. This is an earmark that begets earmarks. This is going to a business organization whose job it is to receive other Federal moneys. There have been many stories written over the past several weeks about organizations like this that exist to draw other Federal moneys. I don't think that you can put it in terms of this Member knows that district and is trying to alleviate poverty or a situation like that.

This is a situation, it seems to me, where earmarks are begetting more earmarks. We simply can't sustain that. With the deficit that we have, with the situation we are in with the Federal Government, we can't sustain doing this for much longer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act (including funds made available in title IV or VIII) may be used for a project for Barracks Row Main Street, Inc.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment would prevent the Barracks Row Main Street Organization from receiving \$.5 million. The certification letter provided by the sponsor of this earmark indicates that these funds will be used to redevelop the Eastern Market Metro Plaza and the triangle park adjacent to it. This is in Washington, D.C., not far from us here on Capitol Hill.

According to its Web site: "The mission of Barracks Row Main Street is to revitalize 8th Street Southeast as a vibrant commercial corridor reconnecting Capitol Hill to the Anacostia River using historic preservation and the arts and economic development tools."

In case you weren't aware, Mr. Chairman, Barracks Row was the first commercial center in Washington, D.C. In 1801, Thomas Jefferson selected the site of 8th and I Streets as the first post for the Marine Corps because of its close proximity to the Navy Yard and the U.S. Capitol in case it needed protection. I sometimes wish those marines were around to protect the taxpayer here or funds from flowing from this institution.

Also, according to the Barracks Row Web site, since 1999 there have been more than 50 facades restored, 40 signs replaced, 40 new businesses opened, three new buildings constructed and one streetscape reconstruction completed. All told, the total amount of public and private funds reinvested has been some \$19 million. At least a portion of that \$19 million has come through Federal earmarks.

The 2006 Transportation appropriation bill included a \$750,000 earmark for the redevelopment of Barracks Row Main Street, Inc. That was apparently the same project included in the earmark that I seek to limit today, the redevelopment of the Eastern Market Metro Plaza.

I would submit that the redevelopment of the Metro Plaza would be more appropriately addressed by the authorizers. If the project were authorized, then we should allow the Transportation appropriators to do this bill.

I also note that this Metro Plaza may be about to receive at least its second earmark. How many more will be required? How much longer will we be doing this? I certainly hope that we are not approving a redevelopment earmark today to redevelop last year's redevelopment earmark.



Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am the named sponsor of this amendment that Mr. FLAKE refers to. Before I continue with any comments about the amendment per se, I would like to, if I could, have a brief colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona.

Has the gentleman from Arizona spent very much time on Barracks Row, this new commercial center that you refer to?

Mr. FLAKE. No, I have not.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Have you been to Barracks Row, had a meal there perhaps?

Mr. FLAKE. I may have. I don't recall.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Have you been to the Marine barracks which are located on Barracks Row?

Mr. FLAKE. I believe I have.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Have you ever attended the Silent March that takes place on Friday evenings at the Marine barracks?

Mr. FLAKE. I have not.

Mr. LEWIS of California. You have not. I would suggest to the gentleman that probably one of the most important things that a Member of Congress should do is to go to the Marine barracks. On 13 Friday evenings annually, approximately 45,000 people enjoy absolutely the best of our Armed Forces displayed by the marches that take place on the Marine barracks on those Friday evenings, a phenomenal, phenomenal experience for those people who care about our Armed Forces, but also know the historic role that Washington, D.C. has played in terms of supporting and building our military.

8th Street is known as Barracks Row because of the Marine barracks. But over a number of years, indeed generations, Barracks Row, 8th Street, had deteriorated very, very significantly. The commercial values had all but been eliminated. And right in the heart of it was this fabulous headquarters of the National Marine Corps known as the Marine barracks.

It seemed to some of us some time ago that it was very logical to take advantage of that location and the Naval Yard's distance just to the south of it and indeed perhaps even create a Georgetown on Capitol Hill.

Over a number of years, with help on both sides of the aisle, the Congress has re-established Barracks Row as a phenomenal spot on Capitol Hill. Today, its commercial value has skyrocketed. It is having a phenomenal impact on the community. The allocation this year for continuing that process is approximately \$500,000. We spend in this bill something like \$650 million in our Capital Support funds overall. This is a minor piece of all of that.

Indeed, Georgetown on Capitol Hill is a very, very worthwhile project. It has

been immensely successful. The return on the Federal investment that has taken place over the years is difficult to measure. But it is truly immeasurable in my mind's eye. The contribution it has made to the capital is a very significant one.

This amendment essentially would rifle shot at that very project. It is a project we all should, Members of the House, along with our staffs who work and live here, should be very proud as a result of this Federal expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I would like to direct my comments more on the sponsor than on the project, although I will speak about the project.

□ 1115

The gentleman is one of the most distinguished Members of the House, certainly a Member who knows the appropriations process, knows the pitfalls of this process called earmarks, and would not knowingly put forth a foolish or unworthy member-item before the House. So I take that very seriously. He is not a rookie who is trying to find his way around the House, as many do every day, but he is one who knows what is acceptable and what is proper and what is dignified, and that is what he is doing.

Secondly, and very important to note, we all have so-called earmarks for our district. This is for the Nation's Capital. This is not something he is bringing back to his district to score points with his constituents, which is proper. There is nothing wrong with that, letting your constituents know you are working in Washington on their behalf. But here he takes time, and, if I may say, dollars that he probably could have asked for his own district, to make sure that something in the Nation's Capital happens and happens properly.

I take that very seriously, because, as I said last night, Mr. REGULA and I are committed in this committee to making life and conditions in D.C. much better than they are.

So I commend the gentleman from California for thinking of a place outside his own district, and I am here in opposition.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to make the point too that when I am in Washington, I live just across the line between Northeast and Southeast. On a number of occasions on Friday evenings, I have had the occasion to be just on the Southeast side of that line down in the area where these maneuvers are taking place.

I doubt that the gentleman could imagine the number of visitors that come into Washington for these events, for these maneuvers, along with the

families of these service people. We regularly, as Members of Congress, get invited, though we are seldom here on Friday evenings to take advantage.

But if you look at the benefit that is probably coming out of these maneuvers and the participation of the public and the support it builds up for our military and for the economy in this area, it is just a dramatic illustration. I just wanted to make that point.

Mr. Chairman, this is not my earmark. I wouldn't even be the stereotypical supporter of this. But it is an illustration of the national value that this earmark would play.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, just as the chairman said, this is consistent with our goal in this committee to enhance this city and make it a capital that we can be proud of, and I congratulate the Member from California for putting in something that, while not affecting his area, will add great value to the city and to the people who live here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. To hear this discussion, one would think we were funding the Marines somehow here. We are not. We are not. We are funding, according to the certification letter, "Funding is to be used for enhancing the Barracks Row Corridor by redeveloping the Eastern Market Metro Plaza."

This is a commercial development, a commercial venture. Home and retail properties in this area have skyrocketed in the past couple of years. The American way is to leverage the equity you have, either in your business or your home, and redevelop the area. That is how every other area in the country does it, almost all without Federal help.

Just because it is here, and I would like to get there and watch the Marines march, but let me say again, this has nothing to do with the Marines marching in Barracks Row. This has to do with subsidizing a commercial enterprise, one that could do just fine on its own, and particularly in this area. I couldn't think of buying in that area. It is far too expensive.

I appreciate the notion of helping out and the sentimentality of Marines marching, and all of us want to help the armed services, but that is not what this is about. This is about subsidizing a commercial venture, and it is not something we should be involved in in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the Marine barracks are only a small piece of Barracks Row, as the gentleman has suggested. The plaza at the end of Plaza Row is one of the pieces that

needed to go together to make this truly a very successful venture on Capitol Hill on behalf of our responsibility to make certain that Capitol Hill, beyond just our presence here, is a successful and vibrant community.

There is absolutely no question that what has happened on 8th Street has been a phenomenal change in the region. It goes beyond the Marine barracks, all the way to the Naval base. I think Members know that not very far away, a new baseball stadium is in the process of being developed. It is going to be a phenomenal region, and this is only one small piece of it.

I know the gentleman spends most of his time in commercial ventures in Arizona. I would suggest he might want to go to 8th Street and take a look at the restaurants. I might even buy you a meal there. It would be a wonderful exposure to a fabulous piece of our Nation's capital, and the Congress can be proud of the contribution they have made here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 106 of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, Clause 5(a) of rule XXI states that, "A bill or joint resolution carrying a tax or tariff measure may not be reported by a committee not having jurisdiction to report tax or tariff measures."

H.R. 2829 is a general appropriation bill, reported by the Appropriations Committee, which, of course, does not have jurisdiction over tax or tariff measures.

Precedent under Clause 5 of rule XXI found in the most recent edition of the House Rules and Manual states, "A limitation on the use of funds contained in a general appropriation bill was held to violate this paragraph."

Further, the Manual refers to at least three rulings during consideration of a general appropriation bill where, "It was shown that the imposition of the restriction on IRS funding for the fiscal year would effectively and inevitably preclude the IRS or the Customs Service from collecting revenues."

In other words, there is ample and clear precedent, Mr. Chairman, that a limitation on funding on the IRS is a revenue measure when it inevitably leads to a reduction in tax revenues, and is therefore subject to a point of order under Clause 5.

Congress authorized the Qualified Tax Collection Contracts Program found in Section 6306 of the Internal Revenue Code to give the IRS additional tools to collect specified amounts of tax, not debt, and the program is thus distinguishable from other debt collection programs in the Federal Government.

To quote from the Internal Revenue Code, Section 6306(b)(1)(B) defines a qualified tax collection contract as one in which the contractor requests a "full payment from such taxpayer of an amount of Federal tax specified by the Secretary."

Legislative history of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004 further bears this out. Citing the Joint Committee on Taxation's general explanation of tax legislation enacted in the 108th Congress, the provision's intent is to "locate and contact taxpayers owing outstanding tax liabilities of any type and to arrange payment of those taxes by the taxpayers. There must be an assessment pursuant to Section 6201 in order for there to be an outstanding tax liability. An assessment is the formal recording of the taxpayer's tax liability that fixes the amount payable."

When authorizing the program, the Congress was specifically attempting to address a category of uncollected taxes, taxes that Congress believed could be more efficiently collected through the use of qualified tax collection contracts. To put it simply, the Congress felt that the IRS's existing authority should be augmented in order to increase tax compliance and tax collection.

Current estimates by the Joint Committee on Taxation, direct correspondence in both writing and recent congressional testimony from the IRS, and even the CBO baseline, indicate that the program is succeeding in collecting additional tax revenues, just as Congress had anticipated, and in excess of the tax revenues collected prior to enactment of Section 6306 of the Internal Revenue Code. Empirical evidence is clear: Enactment of section 106 would inevitably lead to a reduction in the collection of taxes.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the IRS plans to spend \$15 million to administer this program in 2007. This has already led to the collection of \$20 million in tax revenue in this fiscal year. For fiscal year 2008, the IRS requested \$7.35 million in discretionary appropriations to administer the program. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury, by the authority granted in Section 6306 of the Internal Revenue Code, is allowed to retain 25 percent of the taxes collected under the qualified tax collection contract. In fiscal year 2008, the IRS expects to retain \$15 million with this authority.

Clearly, if section 106 of this bill is enacted, the broad reference to "any other Act" will eliminate the Secretary's authority to retain the taxes collected by the program that are necessary to run the program and collect

additional taxes. In addition, a more than 95 percent decrease in funding would occur as a result of the limitation in section 106, and that would have the same effect as reducing the funding to zero. The CBO estimates that it expects the program to collect \$80 million in fiscal year 2008, and the Joint Committee on Taxation expects section 106 to reduce revenues in 2008 by \$69 million.

To substantiate this point and to illustrate that section 106 of H.R. 2829 restricts the ability of the IRS to collect taxes, I refer to a letter I received from the Joint Committee on Taxation: "Section 6306 of the Internal Revenue Code enacted in the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004, authorizes the IRS to enter into qualified tax collection contracts with private debt collection companies to locate and contact taxpayers owing outstanding tax liabilities and to arrange for the payment of those tax liabilities."

The letter goes on to say, "Under section 106 of H.R. 2829, not more than \$1 million of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to enter into, renew, extend, administer, implement, enforce, provide oversight of or make any payment related to any qualified tax collection contract. We interpreted this language as a broad restriction on the use of any funds available to the IRS for administering the private debt collection program, including not only appropriated funds but also funds the IRS is permitted to retain under Section 6306."

"Because section 106 of H.R. 2829 prohibits the IRS from using any more than \$1 million to operate the private debt collection program, which is significantly less than the projected amount of expenditures required by the IRS to operate the program, we expect that operation of the program would cease if the provision were enacted."

The Joint Committee goes on to provide a revenue estimate that details the annual loss of revenue to the Treasury. They estimate that H.R. 2829 would reduce revenues by \$69 million in 2008, \$507 million over the fiscal years 2008 through 2012, and by \$1.086 billion over the fiscal years 2008 through 2017.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against Section 106 of this bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I concede to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained. Section 106 is stricken from the bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as we already know, I conceded that point of order so that issue is not before us. But I think it is important, nevertheless, to speak somewhat to the issue so that people fully understand what it was that this subcommittee was attempting to do.

The whole notion of having private debt collectors collecting taxes throughout this country does not sit well with a lot of people. It is not one

of the most popular programs. In fact, it is a very unpopular program.

No one traditionally has liked the idea of somebody knocking on your door to collect your taxes in a dispute with the government. But at least historically we have had a situation where we knew that the person knocking at our door or on the phone was a member of the government, an employee of the government, who had been trained in how to deal with the public and who fully understood what was within the law allowed in that conversation and in that approach.

We now, in this wild desire to turn our backs on Federal employees and outsource, go out and get private employees to handle much of government's work, we decided to go and set up a system which is really very sad. We now say to a private debt collector, go and collect those taxes; and for doing that, we will give you 24 cents on the dollar.

The American people need to know that. They need to know that for every dollar that is owed to the government, the government is now saying we will hire an outside agency that will go after you, and we will let them keep 24 cents on the dollar. What a waste of government money. What a waste of the taxpayers' money.

It is interesting that we hear folks here get up and tell us we are wasting taxpayer dollars. In fact, in a few minutes the gentleman from Arizona will go back to that issue, although he was not involved in this other one and I don't want to bring him into it. But you talk about a waste of money. Rather than use government employees to go find these dollars, you are going to give away 24 cents on every dollar.

The point of order was based on a belief that this would lose revenue for the government because we would not hire these folks to go find the money, to go collect the money. The whole purpose of our bill was to go back to the day when the employees of the Federal Government would collect the dollars. Nowhere in this bill did it say that by not allowing outsourcing of these jobs, by not allowing private debt collectors, we are giving up on our hope to collect the dollars. That was not the purpose.

So, technically, the point of order was correct, and that is why we conceded it. But when you really analyze this, it would have been and it was a bad decision, because that was not the intent.

Lastly, the very famous hit show "The Sopranos" ended a couple of weeks ago. But had they known that this program was going to continue, they could have had another episode, because I predict that years from now we are going to be back here telling you horror stories about how private debt collectors are collecting those debts. They don't have to answer to the public or to the government, the way we have to, the way Federal employees have to. What they are going to start doing is using all kinds of tactics that

we will live to regret. So there might yet be another Sopranos episode.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX

##### ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Small Business Administration may be used for the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association, SPUR Urban Center.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1130

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit \$231,000 from going to the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association, otherwise known as SPUR. This organization claims to be San Francisco's preeminent public-policy think tank and claims that through research analysis, public education and advocacy, SPUR promotes good planning and good government.

The question we are asked today: Is it good government for the Federal taxpayer to be funding think tanks around the country? You can debate all day long, we only have a couple of minutes here, the merits or demerits of government planning, whether it is a good thing that the suburbs expand or that the policies that this organization promotes are better.

But the question is: Should we be sending Federal taxpayer dollars to an organization with policies that run counter to what some people across the country might think?

I think we should let think tanks think and produce ideas that they want, but let's not support them with Federal funds and take sides in this issue.

As for the specifics of this earmark, according to the sponsor's certification letter, the funding would go towards construction costs associated with a new resource center for small business and community groups in San Francisco. The new resource center will be called the SPUR Urban Center.

SPUR's Web site says, "As we head into the next 50 years of service to San Francisco, SPUR is proposing its most innovative solution yet: Constructing an urban center, the first of its kind in any city west of Chicago. To reach this goal, SPUR is embarking on a \$10 million SPUR Campaign for the Urban Center."

I suppose this funding is meant to help that campaign to raise the \$10 million necessary to build that urban center. The list of donors to this campaign is about four pages long. It includes very sizable donations from some very well-known corporations and organizations. It appears to me and to anyone who reads or looks at the Web site that this fundraising campaign is going fairly well.

Why again are we putting taxpayers on the hook to help with this effort? The organization and center look to have a local focus and policy approaches that too many taxpayers from across the country might have reservations about.

Now, I am familiar with the think tank world. Before coming to Congress, I spent 7 years at the Goldwater Institute in Phoenix. I suppose that there are a lot of people here who would be uncomfortable with the positions that the Goldwater Institute took. I would not presume to get Federal funding for the think tank that I used to work for or any other conservative think tank. That wouldn't be right. I don't think it is right here for any Member to seek money for a think tank at home that might or might not produce ideas that run counter or might be supported by Members here. Think tanks should think on their own without support from the Federal Government in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Since 1959, the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association, SPUR, has been one of California's preeminent public policy think tanks providing research, analysis and public education related to planning and good government.

It was originally formed to revitalize downtown San Francisco by channeling growth away from suburban sprawl and back into the urban core. SPUR provides a neutral educational forum to promote civic engagement, particularly among disadvantaged citizens, businesses operating in areas of high employment, and firms operated by low-income individuals.

SPUR is a widely sought-out resource for small businesses, concerned individuals, local government agencies and other nonprofits, offering educational programs, publishing a monthly journal with the latest information on urban planning and best practices, and convening 20 active policy committees where small business people and community members can become involved in local and regional public policy.

The funds included in the Financial Services appropriations bill are for construction costs associated with the new urban center. The center will allow SPUR to expand its educational

and research programs related to key issues impacting urban businesses and communities.

You know, as I listen to the gentleman, I always know where he is going with his argument because his argument continues to be that only people in agencies know how to spend Federal dollars and that we, Members of Congress, do not. Obviously a program that has been around since 1959 in the City of San Francisco that has played a role in revitalizing the city and its growth, a city we are all proud of, is one that merits our support.

As I am reading what I have in front of me, I am thinking how in private industry we always hold up private industry and corporate America as the ones that do it on their own, and we don't want to do anything for community groups that may be trying to get some government help. But, you know, we have all kind of tax breaks and tax subsidies that we give corporate America to grow and invest. They have their think tanks, except we are talking about billions of dollars, so their think tanks are composed of people they deal with on a daily business.

Local folks, local small business people every so often need government to step in and give them a helping hand, not to carry them on their shoulders, but to help them grow. I think this is a fine example of a program that merits our support. For that reason, not only do I support it, but I respectfully rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from New York, is this his earmark?

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. This is not my earmark. But you know something, as chairman of the committee that carries the earmarks, I respect the fact that every Member has a right to put them forth, and we looked at all of them, as did Mr. REGULA, and the earmarks that are here are earmarks that we feel are proper.

Mr. FLAKE. For the record, I believe this is the Speaker's earmark. It would have been nice to have a colloquy like we were having on this earmark with the sponsor of the earmark. That is what would be nice about this process, if we could actually have the sponsor of the earmark come and explain it.

I would like to know, for example, taking the example that the gentleman gave that I seem to be willing to let the Federal Government, the agencies, go ahead and spend this money, I would be upset if the Federal agencies designated this themselves. They shouldn't give out money like this.

If the Federal agencies responsible for disbursing this kind of money gave money to the Goldwater Institute, I would expect the gentleman and every-

body else to say that is not a proper use of money. I would do that if it was put in by a Member as well. It is not who spends the money; it is whether this money should be spent by the Federal Government.

I am not defending the Bush administration's spending of money that is earmarked. I have noted many times that much of the money in the Homeland Security bill that is spent in my district is not a wise use of Federal taxpayer dollars. It shouldn't be spent.

The question is not who spends it. We shouldn't use that as an excuse saying that the Federal agencies will misspend the money, so we have a right to do that as well. We have a right to misspend that money and designate think tanks who should receive it just because they might do the same thing over there.

Our role is to authorize, appropriate, and conduct oversight. My issue is that we have done far too little authorizing, far too much appropriating, and far too little oversight. Oversight needs to be done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX

##### ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Small Business Administration may be used for the Mitchell County Development Foundation, Inc. for the Home of the Perfect Christmas Tree project.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that I have been called many things during this effort to shine the light on some Federal earmarks and to try to promote a little accountability. I am prepared after this amendment to answer to the name "Grinch" and head back up to my mountain just north of Who-ville.

This amendment would prevent \$129,000 from being used by the Mitchell County Development Foundation

for the Home for the Perfect Christmas Tree Project.

The Mitchell County Development Foundation is a nonprofit dedicated to creating jobs and strengthening the educational system, as well as promoting tourism in Mitchell County.

It has been reported that the Home of the Perfect Christmas Tree Project is an economic development initiative in economically distressed Mitchell County.

According to the project's Web site, author Gloria Houston gave the rights to her award-winning children's book, "The Year of the Perfect Christmas Tree," to the town of Spruce Pine, North Carolina, in 2003.

To help with the economic challenges facing the region following the loss of manufacturing jobs, the Home of the Perfect Christmas Tree Project was created to assist entrepreneurs selling handmade crafts and products based on the book.

The money included in this earmark would go towards doubling the retail space available for the gift shop selling products like Christmas tree ornaments, lanterns, handmade soaps, et cetera.

I have no doubt that Mitchell County is having tough times economically. I don't belittle that fact. It sounds like they are. And I don't dispute the fact that they may be home to the perfect Christmas tree either, although Arizona has some very nice ones.

What I do doubt is that there is a Federal role here in doling out funds to the Mitchell County Development Foundation.

First, from the sponsor's certification letter, we learn that these funds are requested because the project is expected to double to include 60 licensed product makers in 2007. If this project is successful, does it still need taxpayer assistance?

Additionally, according to the USDA's Economic Research Service, there are nearly 400 persistently poor counties in the U.S. These are counties with 20 percent or more of their populations living in poverty for the last 30 years. These counties comprise 12 percent of U.S. counties and 4 percent of the population.

Are we to assume that the taxpayers should dig into their wallets and find ways of providing hundreds of thousands of dollars for each of these counties as a means of dealing with economic hardship? We simply can't do that. We simply can't cure every ill out there.

I would submit it is often said that this bill has become a Christmas tree. Unfortunately, this bill has a Christmas tree. I would think it is simply not a good use of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and friend from Arizona for offering this amendment. It gives me an opportunity to explain the importance of this project and this funding to the Members of this body.

I am actually very much in favor of transparency through the appropriations process. I have spoken a number of times here on the House floor about that. I think it is important that Members can judge for themselves the funds that we are spending as the Federal Government. It is a very serious business we are in of spending taxpayer dollars, and I don't take that lightly.

I am thankful for the opportunity to talk about the Mitchell County Development Foundation and the problems and challenges that Mitchell County is going through, but their hope and the solution they are putting forward.

Mitchell County, as the amendment sponsor mentions, is a very hard-hit county. If you look at this graph of manufacturing jobs in North Carolina, we have been hard hit over the last 20 years in the loss of manufacturing jobs due to Federal trade agreements, to a large degree. We are going through a transition period of manufacturing jobs in North Carolina.

Furthermore, in Mitchell County, which was a manufacturing county, you can look at this listing of the job losses they have had over the last 10 years. In the last 5 years, Mitchell County has lost 2,500 jobs. Now, that may not seem like much to big city folks, but to a small, rural Appalachian county with a workforce of 7,500 people, it is devastating. It is absolutely devastating.

When you are in a rural community, you have to figure out ways to innovate, to actually keep your people making a living. What Mitchell County has done through their development foundation is come up with a way to do that, to take these craftsmen who worked in textiles and furniture, to actually help them create a small business. And through this project, 51 small businesses have been created, two-thirds in my district.

But this is a small, rural county, and they are trying to do the best they can through an innovative process. This small amount of Federal money will help them in a number of ways, such as access other grants and bring in more knowledge about this process and about what is happening in this county, to bring more funding and resources to bear for this county.

□ 1145

Mitchell County has the third highest unemployment rate in the State of North Carolina. It has a 38 percent dropout rate in their high schools. And what they're trying to do through this business incubator is create small businesses so that those unemployed can find employment. Beyond that, they are also trying to use the resources that they gain from selling their products to provide scholarships for these

high school students, to encourage them to stay in school. This is a good project and is a worthy use of Federal taxpayer dollars and I'm proud to stand in the well of this House and to defend this and tell my colleagues that it's worthwhile for the taxpayers to spend this money.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I retain the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. May I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Both sides have 2 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. May I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank my friend from Arizona for yielding. I want to thank him for his amendment.

What we have before us is an earmark that is in a family of earmarks, where somehow we in Congress think it is advisable to take money out of local communities, give it a big haircut, and then send it back as local economic development. I question what does the Federal Government know about economic development to begin with. I am going to support the gentleman from Arizona's amendment, but I did want to say something about the gentleman from North Carolina. But for his leadership in coming to the floor to fight for transparency and accountability, he wouldn't have to be here today defending the earmark, and I wanted to congratulate the gentleman for being willing to submit his earmark to this process. Now, I don't think his earmark meets the taxpayer test of efficiency or accountability, but I did want to applaud his leadership in improving the process and bringing transparency and accountability to the floor.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MCHENRY. Absolutely.

Mr. REGULA. How much private investment in your judgment will this generate locally, knowing they're getting some assistance?

Mr. MCHENRY. There's already been a real influx of interest in giving grants to this. Right now there's about three or \$400,000 that is contingent upon this to a large degree.

Mr. REGULA. Thank you.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I suggest to my colleagues that they pay close attention to their TV sets because I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and in support of the gentleman's program. Now, I'm going to do that and try to remain serious, because I'm supporting an earmark by the gentleman who spent over 3 days beating the heck out of all the earmarks on the House floor and telling us that he had never seen an earmark that he liked. I obvi-

ously saw an earmark that I like, his earmark, and he saw an earmark that he liked.

Granted that it's got a pretty bad title because people think it's a Christmas tree and Christmas tree opens up a discussion for loading up and all kinds of other things, but we actually looked at it and it's a worthy project.

My point in diplomatically somewhat embarrassing him is the point that I can see in him an ability and a desire to help his community, and he could not see in us for 3½ torturous days our desire to help our community. And so I am rising as chairman of the committee asking both sides to go against Mr. FLAKE and support the gentleman's earmark because it indeed is one that helps his community and that's what it's all about.

But in the process of doing that, we also have to be careful what we say. The gentleman from Texas said that he supported Mr. FLAKE but opposed your amendment but thanked you for making this process possible. I have a surprise for you. Even if you had said nothing against earmarks, Mr. FLAKE was going to say something about earmarks for as long as he could because he's known for that.

So this is a very convoluted situation that I find myself in. But I support your earmark, I want you to take full credit for it, I want you to put a press release out and if you don't, I will put a press release out naming your program because I think it's a wonderful program and you should be proud of it.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm going to make it more convoluted, because I've actually read the book that this earmark is titled after. It is a wonderful, wonderful children's book, and I say that with all sincerity. It's unfortunate that the earmark was named after the Perfect Christmas Tree, but the book itself, written by a local author, has produced a substantial amount of employment and funds for this area of North Carolina.

And for us to demean the notion of a perfect Christmas tree, which is the title to the book, a children's book, further convolutes this. I find myself kind of defending the Perfect Christmas Tree.

Mr. SERRANO. And reclaiming my time, with all due respect to both gentlemen from North Carolina and Arizona, we know that the perfect Christmas tree only grows in upstate New York and that's a fact of life.

Mr. MCHENRY. If the gentleman will yield, I just wanted to correct the chairman on what I said over those torturous 3 days, in your words, on this House floor. I was simply asking for earmarks to be public.

Mr. SERRANO. Reclaiming my time, English is a second language to me, but I assure you that I know what you said and you were not saying that you just wanted information. You were saying

these were bad things. Except that you found a good one and I support you on it. So as they say in the south Bronx, quit while you're ahead. Just take the earmark and publicize it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2 minutes.

Mr. McHENRY. I thank the chairman.

To close on this matter, Laura Bush, the First Lady, decides what the theme is for the White House Christmas, and she decided this last Christmas it would be the Year of the Perfect Christmas Tree, the Gloria Houston book that we're discussing here. Gloria Houston, who grew up in the mountains of western North Carolina, my district, who gave her book to this community for their business incubator, and it's unfortunate that there's so much discussion here on the House floor about this business incubator, but it does bring to light what is important for this community.

Laura Bush, the First Lady, said at the time: "This is a very wonderful American story. They all worked together, the people in the town, to figure out a new industry for themselves."

I'm trying to assist in that and I think the taxpayers should assist in that. And I'll tell you why. Mitchell County has been broken by trade agreements made here by the Federal Government. And when the Federal Government breaks it, they should help fix it. And that's all we're trying to do. This small amount of taxpayer dollars can help enormously.

I submit for the RECORD the USA Today story about Mitchell County and their recovery.

[From USA Today, Dec. 5, 2006]

#### TOWN HANGS HOPE ON HOLIDAY TREES

PROJECT SPRUCES UP MORALE AFTER LAYOFFS

(By Kathy Kiely)

WASHINGTON.—In Gloria Houston's 1988 children's classic, *The Year of the Perfect Christmas Tree*, a combination of pluck, tenacity and never-say-die optimism salvages the holidays for an impoverished little girl.

This year, residents of a small town in the same Appalachian hills that inspired Houston's story are hoping to reproduce its magic for their hard-luck community.

During the past four years, closings and layoffs at local textile and furniture mills have eliminated more than 2,500 jobs in western North Carolina's Mitchell County. "We have lost one-third of our manufacturing base," says Shirley Hise, director of the local Chamber of Commerce. "It has been devastating for our county."

Even so, the people of Mitchell County are experiencing what local congressman Patrick McHenry calls "a glimmer of hope." Houston's generosity and Hise's hard work are helping county residents tap a vein of creativity and find new ways to make a living. And this holiday season, Americans can help them out—and, at the same time, decorate their homes in presidential style.

Last week, when she hosted the annual unveiling of holiday decorations at the White House, first lady Laura Bush went out of her way to give a plug to the handmade orna-

ments provided by Mitchell County artists. "This is a very wonderful American story," she said. "They all worked together, the people in the town, to figure out a new industry for themselves, and they came up with making these wonderful ornaments."

The media-savvy first lady even provided some direction for the TV crews on hand: "When you're in the west reception hall or in the visitors' reception room on the east side, I hope you'll be able to get there to get some B-roll of those trees and see these beautiful, handmade ornaments."

Mitchell County's contribution to the White House holiday decor is the result of a brainstorm Houston had in 2003 after being invited to be grand marshal of the Christmas parade in Spruce Pine, Mitchell's county seat.

After hearing about the community's problems, Houston donated the rights of her book to Spruce Pine and suggested local officials market the town as "the home of the perfect Christmas tree." Last year, the community cut the ribbon on a retail store featuring handcrafted items inspired by the book. They're all made by local artisans.

These aren't amateur holiday fair items: The curvilinear red, green and walnut Carolina "snowflakes" hanging at the White House are the creations of Billie Ruth Sudduth, a basket weaver whose work is displayed at the juried Smithsonian craft show. The White House trees also feature handblown glass ornaments by Virgil Jones, whose work is on display in galleries in Asheville, N.C.

Sudduth taught several local women how to make the snowflakes so they could help her keep up with demand. At a basket-weaving class she taught to raise money for the local homeless shelter, "I saw some talent," she says.

No one is suggesting a few cottage industries will replace the thousands of manufacturing jobs that once powered Mitchell County's economy. McHenry, who called the project a glimmer of hope, also notes it's not a light at the end of the tunnel.

But project participants say it has helped lift the gloom that enveloped Mitchell County after all the layoffs. "This project has really turned the county upside down with excitement," Sudduth says.

Patti Jensen, who manages the retail outlet in Spruce Pine, says her biggest problem initially was persuading local craftspeople to provide her with enough inventory to keep pace with sales.

"They were so skeptical . . . that anyone would want to buy what they make," Jensen says.

After one of Marquitta Holdscraw's art glass plates sold for \$600 at a local silent auction, Jensen says she found the artist in the parking lot in tears. "It just blew her away that anyone valued what she was doing," Jensen says. Holdscraw's plates are available for as little as \$39.50 through the Home of the Perfect Christmas Tree store. An online catalog can be found at [homeofthepperfectchristmastree.org](http://homeofthepperfectchristmastree.org).

Working on their own poses challenges that employees of big companies never face, the artisans concede, especially "the very real problem of health insurance," says Sudduth, 61. She says it costs \$700 a month to maintain her coverage.

Jim Buchanan, a woodworker who built the interior of the Perfect Christmas Tree shop and designs items for the catalog, estimates he's making half of what he did before the Henredon furniture plant where he worked was shuttered in 2004. But there are other compensations. "I'm making the type of furniture I like to make, so it's more enjoyable," Buchanan says.

Mike Queen, a local metal worker who is trying to grow his artisanal blacksmithing

business, agrees. "I'm enthused about it," says Queen, who employs several people laid off from local plants. "It's good for the community. There's so many small towns in the country that seem like they're dying."

#### THE IDEA WENT BY THE BOOK

Gloria Houston, whose book inspired the Home of the Perfect Christmas Tree store in Spruce Pine, N.C., says research she did as a graduate student prompted her to suggest the project.

Houston, a former Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings scholar at the University of South Florida, says she was researching the namesake of her fellowship when it struck her that Rawlings had inadvertently thrown a lifeline to her tiny Florida hometown, the setting for her classic novel, *The Yearling*. "I realized Cross Creek would have long since disappeared had it not been for *The Yearling*," Houston says. "Everything there had something to do with it."

Years later, she decided to see whether her 1988 children's book, *The Home of the Perfect Christmas Tree*, could do the same for her North Carolina Appalachian home.

Houston's parents operated a country store in western North Carolina for more than 50 years. In writing the book, she was inspired by stories of their circumstances (her father told her about once giving up his Christmas dime so his sister could have a doll).

Not wanting the same crushing poverty to reappear in the region, Houston donated rights to the book to Mitchell County, and the Christmas tree store project was born. "I'm so proud of the people here and their many skills and talents," she says. "Now they're being put to work in their own county."

In closing, I want to tell you, Mitchell County is going through struggles, and I appreciate this opportunity to bring attention to this. It is a worthwhile project. It is a worthy project. And I think worthy projects that have a Federal element to it should be funded by the Federal Government, and we should be interested in doing that. Not overspending, but spending wisely and allowing Members to step forward and publicly say what they think is a wise expenditure of taxpayer dollars. I care very much about that. And I care very much about helping Mitchell County rebound, to bring down that dropout rate in their high schools, to get businesses growing and to reduce their unemployment rate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for the remainder of his time.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chairman.

I think the spirit of Christmas seems to have broken out here, with Democrats agreeing with Republicans and dogs and cats living together and everything else. I'll probably get beat soundly on this amendment.

Let me simply say in defense of the gentleman from North Carolina, we would likely not be in this situation where we're debating earmarks on the floor had he not persistently for 3 days helped in the effort to make sure that there is transparency here. And you can be for earmarks or against earmarks. But I think we ought to all be for transparency, and I think that's the message that he helped and very persuasively brought to the floor during



those 3 days. I appreciate his efforts there, all for the opportunity to be flogged in this fashion.

I would simply say, and, like I say, I don't want to belittle the economic problems in Mitchell County, but I should point out again there are 400 counties around the country comprising 12 percent of all U.S. counties, 4 percent of the U.S. population, that are in persistent poverty. When you pick like this, we're picking certain winners and losers who are to get Federal funding instead of recognizing that there is opportunity cost to funding as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. ELLSWORTH

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. ELLSWORTH:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

**TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 901. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to enter into a contract in an amount greater than the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract that the contractor owes no Federal tax debt. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the certification requirement of part 52.209-5 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall also include a requirement for a certification by a prospective contractor of whether, within the three-year period preceding the offer for the contract, the prospective contractor—

(1) has or has not been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against the contractor for violating any tax law or failing to pay any tax;

(2) has or has not been notified of any delinquent taxes for which the liability remains unsatisfied; or

(3) has or has not received a notice of a tax lien filed against the contractor for which the liability remains unsatisfied or for which the lien has not been released.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ELLSWORTH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the point of order and I

will ask for unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

But before I do that, I would like to at least spell out what this amendment intends and what I intended with the amendment. We're talking about earmarks. This is an earmark of a little different sort. It's earmarking the collection of Federal taxes owed to this government. This amendment sought to ensure that none of the funds appropriated in this bill could be used to enter into a contract greater than the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor certified in writing to the agency awarding the contract that they owed no Federal tax dollars and no Federal tax debt.

The Federal acquisition regulation already requires prospective contractors to certify within a 3-year period preceding the offer that they've never been convicted and had a civil judgment against them for various legal infractions such as tax evasion, forgery, or bribery. This amendment is very simple. It simply adds the following three tax debt-related offenses:

That the prospective contractor must certify that they have not ever been convicted of a civil judgment rendered against the contractor for violating any tax law or failing to pay any tax.

Have or have not been notified of any delinquent taxes for which liability remains unsatisfied.

Or, number three, have or have not received a notice of a tax lien filed against the contractor for which liability remains unsatisfied or for which the lien has not been released.

Very simply put, Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention and the attention of many of my constituents that Federal contracts are being awarded to companies that have not paid their Federal taxes. This really isn't just a small matter. These are companies that continue to receive Federal contracts, 3,800 in fact, that owe \$1.4 billion in Federal taxes.

Now, I pay my taxes every year. I'm sure everybody in this room does and I'm sure everybody up in the gallery does. To award a Federal contract to a company that fails to pay gives them an unfair advantage. The people in the Eighth District of Indiana don't expect us to do this, and I don't think anybody across the country expects us to continue to do this. Yet it continues to go on and on and on. I've offered this amendment in other bills and I'll continue to offer it until this Congress does its work and ensures this.

Not all contractors that receive Federal contracts are bad players, but when 3,800 don't pay \$1.4 billion, we need to put a stop to it. At a time when our fiscal house appears to be in somewhat disarray and the deficit continues to grow, we can't continue to allow companies like this to receive Federal tax dollars and Federal contracts.

While I am withdrawing this amendment today, I respectfully ask the chairman to include this language in the eventual conference report.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. WOLF:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

**TITLE IX**

**ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 901. (a) There is hereby enacted into law H.R. 473 of the 110th Congress, as introduced in the House of Representatives on January 16, 2007, and appropriated for the Commission thereby established, \$1,500,000.

(b) The amount otherwise provided in this Act for "INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—ELECTION ASSISTANCE—ELECTION REFORM PROGRAMS" (for the amount specified under such heading for programs under the Help America Vote Act of 2002) is hereby reduced by \$1,500,000.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 1200

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I am going to withdraw the amendment, but I would be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to call to the attention the financial storm and the tsunami that is off the coast ready to hit our Nation.

Our Nation's Federal fiscal policy remains unsustainable, and in last Thursday's Washington Post, Comptroller General David Walker referred to what called to a "tsunami of spending" that will result in "very rough seas, like we've never seen before in this country."

If Congress is not proactive in addressing the mounting entitlement costs and fiscal outlook 30 years from now, we won't be here deciding how to spend discretionary funds in an appropriations bill, there won't be any money left for anything. In 2006, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, consumed 40 percent of the budget. That percentage will jump to 51 percent in 10 years, and there will be a devastating impact on the country.

In less than 20 years, there will be no money for student loans, transportation funding, national parks or cancer research or autism research, just to name a few.

More than \$2.6 billion a day is needed to fund the savings shortfall, which has left us with nearly 40 percent of our GDP in foreign hands. The Saudis hold



a lot of our debt, the Saudis hold a lot of our debt. The Chinese hold a lot of our debt.

On Tuesday, the Budget Committee held a hearing on foreign holdings of U.S. debt, and the vulnerability of our economy. The CBO director testified that increases in foreign holdings accounted for about 86 percent of total Federal borrowing last year.

We should care about that. We should care that the Saudis hold this debt, the Chinese that hold this debt. China is the largest single source of financing for the current U.S. account deficit. While the U.S. falls deeper and deeper into debt, other countries are saving. Although China usually gets most of the attention, it's also Saudi Arabia. Fifteen of the hijackers for 9/11 came from Saudi Arabia, Iran and Kuwait.

This amendment incorporate to expedite a national commission, eight members from each side to come together. This place is a partisan, political pit. There is no opportunity in this Congress to resolve these issues.

We can't even decide when we are going to adjourn around here sometimes. So what we take is eight Republicans, eight Democrats come together, put everything on the table. Everything has to be on the table, including tax policy.

This Commission would make recommendations and would hold public hearings around the country where the American people could have input. They will come back.

What makes this different than most others is that this would be like the base closing commission. It would require a vote to be taken by the Congress.

But 10 years from now, 20 years from now, when many of our people are going to be sitting on the rocking chair, having served in this Congress, and editorials and the newspaper headlines say "Nation in crisis," we are going to ask, what did we do?

I have written a number of Dear Colleague letters. We are up to 31 cosponsors, Members cosponsored this. We need eight Members from each side, everything on the table, recommendations would come back, require the Congress to vote. But for our children and for our grandchildren, I would ask that we do this.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask to include a Washington Post article by David Broder and also some other material in support of the idea.

[From washingtonpost.com, Feb. 1, 2007]

#### DEFICIT DAY OF RECKONING

(By David S. Broder)

Next Monday is the real day of reckoning for President Bush and this new Democratic Congress. That is the day the president sends his budget for next year up to Capitol Hill, and you really will be able to judge by the reaction what will happen in Washington in the next 9 months.

Last year, when the budget came out, Democrats hooted in skepticism and many conservative Republicans expressed dismay at the size of the projected deficits. In the end, the House and Senate could not agree

on a budget resolution, and the government went on autopilot in terms of domestic spending, continuing at the same level as the year before.

This year, as I learned from conversations with two senior White House officials last week, the president hopes his budget will become a starting point for serious negotiation—not a partisan football or simple laughingstock.

That hope was encouraged by a letter to the president last week from the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate, Rep. Nancy Pelosi and Sen. Harry M. Reid, and the chairmen of the two budget committees, Rep. John M. Spratt Jr. and Sen. Kent Conrad.

The first sentence said, "We are writing to express our strong interest in working cooperatively with you to address our Nation's fiscal challenges." It acknowledged that as the process unfolds, "Democrats and Republicans will disagree about particular priorities, and we will need to negotiate our differences in deciding how to allocate scarce resources."

But it put forward four principles that could lead to a successful budget outcome this year.

"The budget should account realistically for projected federal costs," including the billions needed for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the adjustments needed in the alternative minimum tax, which otherwise would punish millions of middle-class families.

"The budget should realistically project short- and long-term deficits," as objectively as the calculations of the Congressional Budget Office, which show the prospect of very large deficits if current tax and spending policies are unchanged.

"The budget should provide detail throughout the entire budget period," making clear the hard choices that lie ahead.

"The budget should be based on fiscal discipline that is sustained over the long term," underlining the fact that it will take years of effort to repair the damage done to our fiscal condition in the past 6 years.

The House took an important first step in repairing our fiscal health last month by reimposing the "pay-go" rule, requiring any increase in entitlements or tax relief to be balanced with tax increases or spending cuts.

While not endorsing these specific principles, the White House officials with whom I met certainly pledged to make visible the costs of the war and to be specific about the trade-offs needed to maintain budget discipline, both in the short term and the long term.

They said that the economic assumptions underlying the president's budget are modest—if anything, an underestimate of the revenue likely to be produced by a growing economy. And the officials indicated that the president will recommend that, for a second year in a row, overall growth in discretionary domestic spending—the part separate from Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security—be held close to zero.

If Monday's budget fulfills those promises, the stage could be set for a serious effort to put the federal fiscal house in order.

But the warning voiced in an interview by Rep. David R. Obey of Wisconsin, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, must be borne in mind. Obey recalled that when the late Rep. Richard Bolling of Missouri invented the congressional budget process, he said, "It will work only if all the key players—in Congress and the administration—use honest figures and make a genuine effort to live within its discipline. Otherwise, the budget process will become a barrier to action."

If the congressional budget process breaks down, two Republicans, Rep. Frank R. Wolf

of Virginia and Sen. George V. Voinovich of Ohio, have proposed a commission of legislators and experts to tackle the long-term budget challenges and bring back a plan that Congress would have to vote up or down, or substitute an equally effective blueprint.

One way or the other, this problem must be faced. Monday's budget message could be the first step.

[From the South Florida Sun-Sentinel, Mar. 27, 2007]

#### NATIONAL DEBT

ISSUE: Comptroller warns of fiscal disaster.

The alarm clock is ringing. Time to wake up!

The "alarm clock" is David Walker, comptroller general of the United States and head of the Government Accountability Office. He's on a nationwide "Fiscal Wake-Up Tour," which he plans to continue through the 2008 elections.

His purpose is to warn Americans of the fiscal train wreck the Nation faces if it doesn't get its fiscal house in order. He's urging people to let the Federal government know they want something done about the problem.

That's crucial, because elected officials like to buy voter support with low taxes and big spending programs. That will never change unless the public lets its leaders know they can raise taxes and cut spending without being punished at the polls.

There's little choice. Things will grow exponentially worse as the Baby Boom generation begins collecting on entitlement programs. In the next few decades, the national debt, now at a record \$8.8 trillion, could rise to more than \$46 trillion.

Interest payments on a debt of that size would consume every cent the Federal government currently collects in taxes. It's conceivable that little or nothing would be left for national defense, roads and other infrastructure, entitlement programs, environmental initiatives, etc. The Nation can't operate that way.

Fortunately, Walker has help. He's accompanied on his tour by bipartisan representatives of leading think tanks, and recently U.S. Rep. Frank Wolf, R-Va., filed legislation to create a bipartisan commission to tackle the problem. Everything would be on the table, from taxes to entitlement spending. The bill would require Congress to vote on the commission's recommendations in their entirety.

If you want your country to remain strong and prosperous, let your members of Congress know you support this legislation. Self-indulgence got us into this mess. Only self-discipline can get us out.

**BOTTOM LINE:** The United States must attack this problem now, before it bankrupts the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

## TITLE IX

## ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Small Business Administration may be used for the Fairplex Trade and Conference Center, Pomona, California.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this is another rerun amendment, because this bill contains another rerun earmark. I came last year to challenge the same earmark, and it's back.

This is the Fairplex Trade and Conference Center. It's located in Pomona, California, and more than one Member has been involved in the effort to secure earmark funding for this conference center.

According to the Web site, "Fairplex is home to the annual L.A. County Fair and more than 300 other events each year. Included are consumer and trade shows, meetings, expositions, conventions, inter-track wagering, sporting events and agricultural events." Its Web site says that Fairplex is governed by the Los Angeles County Fair Association. The association is self-supporting and does not fall under the auspices of any county or State governmental body.

Now, Fairplex may not fall under the auspices of any county or State governmental body, but it has had its share of Federal funding over the years, which begs the question, is the association really self-supporting or not?

With a steady stream of earmark funding for the organization, I wonder if it is really dependent on this funding. Would Fairplex or the association be able to sustain its operation without annual earmarks? If it would, why do we need to do it in that case? Why would we have an organization that's either dependent on continued earmarks or one that could exist just fine without them?

Again, there are about 300 events at Fairplex every year. This year it hosted an international wine and spirits competition and an international extra virgin olive oil competition. It will have a 4th of July celebration next week. There is a Sheraton Suites hotel on the Fairplex campus.

With all of these sources of income, I really doubt that Fairplex needs a stream of taxpayer dollars that have come their way virtually every year. Why, this again begs the question, why are we doing this? Why is Federal money going here for a commercial venture? What makes Los Angeles County Fairgrounds more deserving than, say, Yazoo County, Mississippi; Cook County, Illinois or Slope County, North Dakota?

We certainly cannot fund every county fairground in the country. By choosing one or a few, we are picking win-

ners and losers among them. I would appreciate an explanation as to how, out of the thousands of earmark requests that come, the committee narrows its list to a few hundred like this one in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am glad my colleague has stated the background of the fair, but I don't know if he knows it has been around for many decades. Yes, it is very well attended, hosts many functions, has all of the buildings that he is talking about. Yet it is still so old that a lot of it is in very, very serious stages of decay. By that, it needs some restructuring. But that's beside the point.

What this does is for a center to be made, and I'll read what it really is about. It's Fairplex Trade and Conference Center, will be 85,000 square foot, state-of-the-art conference and exhibition center, complete with broadband connectivity, campus-wide wireless integration, as well as satellite two-way communications gear, attracting and benefiting small business. It will have both small and medium-sized meeting rooms outfitted with high-tech equipment ideally suited to help small business during events.

This is an ideal setting to convene small businesses from my area and from outside of the United States to share their ideas and compatibilities to do business.

The amendment that is proposed by my colleague would strip the funding from the SBA account for construction of this non-profit entity, a building that will create jobs and provide businesses in a disadvantaged community. I am talking about the number one crime city in the State of California, that's Pomona.

Unfortunately, there has not been the foresight from the surrounding community to help combat crime or to try to provide more economic development. Pomona itself had not had a general plan of review in almost 30 years. They hadn't had new investments.

This will help bring all of that, not only to Pomona, but to the surrounding communities which Mr. DREIER, Mr. MILLER and Ms. SOLIS are around, would help foster that economic growth by bringing together small businesses, entrepreneurship and being able to do international trade.

The center itself is projected to provide roughly 1,700 jobs and provide economic stimulus. Already, 90 small businesses have registered to work.

Mr. Chair, the trade conference is scheduled to cost \$25 million, minimum. Of that, Fairplex is putting in \$5 million; City of Pomona, \$7 million;

EDA competitive grants, \$5 million; SBA, which we are hoping to be able to get, \$250,000; and the county and State, \$6,750,000 with private sponsorship putting in the rest.

This project could be so beneficial to my whole area, not just my communities, but to the whole general area that is not really part of Los Angeles proper. It is more into the Inland Empire and has been, what I call, a neglected area of Los Angeles County. It enjoys a lot of respect and a lot of support from not only the communities, but the many cities around it.

As my colleague has aptly pointed out, it hosts a whole slew of activities for the whole southern part of California. It is used also for Federal events.

We have had at least two times a year 4,000 naturalization swearing-in ceremonies. Iraqi elections were held there 2 years ago. As representative for the city, I am proud to support this economic development issue and to try to bring more business and jobs to my area.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on my colleague Mr. FLAKE's amendment.

I also want to thank Mr. DREIER. This is not his bill nor his area, but he has always been very supportive of what we are trying to do. I certainly thank you for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. I have great respect for the gentlelady, as she knows. This is just one of many projects like this.

Mr. Chairman, again, I would simply make the point that the gentlelady mentioned, that there are millions and millions of dollars contributed by State and local governments to this effort. There are millions of dollars that come in commercial transactions of conferences that are presented. This is simply \$250,000. Why are we doing it at all? It clearly isn't dependent on the \$250,000, I believe. Last year, because we didn't do earmarks in many of these bills, it didn't receive the funding. It's still up and going just fine.

The question is why do we do this? Why does the committee feel it proper to actually designate funding for something like this when we have such dire needs elsewhere in the Federal budget?

That's what we are here for today. That's why we are challenging earmarks like this, particularly with this bill.

This bill, with financial services, in my view, it's kind of the soft underbelly of the earmarking world, where you have economic development earmarks, that you can justify economic development anywhere in the country. Spending money, by its very nature, generates economic activity. So you could justify any earmark anywhere if you simply say it generates economic activity, it's important to my district.

But when we do it in this fashion, we simply pick winners and losers out there. I wouldn't think that's our place.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I certainly respect Mr. FLAKE's views. I certainly think he has every right to challenge. This has always been a very transparent earmark that we've had since last year, which was not approved last year. It will create jobs. I need those jobs in my area. Yes, there are many areas in the United States that could really be able to use funding from the committee.

However, if we don't help create those jobs, we can't spur the economy, and we can't help put more funding into the Federal budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I share Mr. FLAKE's commitment to reducing government spending and making sure taxpayer dollars are spent in the most efficient and effective way possible.

I would also like to say that I am a strong proponent of making earmarks more transparent by attaching Members' names to their sponsored projects. My feeling all along has been that if a member is not willing to defend their earmark on the floor of the House, then it was probably not worth the money. That is why I was so gratified to see the Majority include projects and their supporters in each appropriations bill. Especially, so that no member has to guess whose district each of these projects is in.

So now, I welcome the opportunity to support Fairplex, a non-profit institution that contributes every day to our local community. Fairplex, located in Pomona, CA, represented by my friend and colleague GRACE NAPOLITANO is host to over 300 events each year, and 2 years ago, they had the privilege of hosting out-of-country voting for the historic Iraqi elections. There is \$250,000 provided in this bill for the Trade and Conference Center, which is an incredibly important addition to the Fairplex that will provide small businesses with a venue to operate, share ideas, and grow. This project is a model of the Small Business Administration's mission of facilitating the environment necessary for America's small businesses to succeed.

Mr. Chairman, 43 percent of the goods coming to and from the consumers and workers of the United States of America come through the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. One of the most important centers for trade, planning and strategic meetings has been held at the Fairplex. As we look at our quest of trying to open up new markets for U.S. goods and services all around the world and as we look at ensuring that American consumers can have access to the best quality product at the lowest possible price, the utilization of this trade and convention center is critically important.

As important as the issue of global trade is, I was really struck when the December before last, I had the opportunity to listen to a friend of mine who happened to be at the Fairplex Trade and Conference Center. I have shared this story before but it is worth reminding my colleagues. Leading up to the December 15, 2005 Iraqi elections, of the eight planned voting sites for the Iraqi people who are here in the United States of America, one of those had unfortunately and unexpectedly closed down.

And what happened? The people at the Fairplex Trade and Conference Center came forward, and literally at the drop of a hat, they

were able to provide the chance for Iraqis who were in this country on that Election Day to exercise that right to vote. Their ability to be on the frontline to participate in the Global War on Terror is something that I believe is vitally important.

I was listening on the phone as applause went up every single time that a ballot was placed into that voting box, and it was a great moment. And as we look for continued progress in Iraq, I am reminded of each of those votes that were cast at the Fairplex Trade and Conference Center. This particular earmark is there helping us in the Global War on Terror and helping us remain competitive globally.

We in the House strive for Federal, State and local cooperation on a myriad of issues, from national security, to education to disaster response. Coordination and investment by all levels of government can give programs a much better chance for success. That is exactly what is happening at the Trade and Conference Center with all levels of government involvement and more important, private sector investment. It is worthy of this continued Federal partnership.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 28 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX

##### ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Small Business Administration may be used for the Advantage West Economic Development Group, Certified Entrepreneurial Community Program.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this would prohibit \$231,000 for Advantage West Economic Development Group, that's the Certified Entrepreneurial Community Program.

Many of the earmarks in this bill are for economic development organizations, business incubators, workforce development programs and the like. But just because there are hundreds of similar earmarks in this bill doesn't mean that providing this kind of earmark for economic development is okay.

In doing research on the different earmarks, many of them begin to sound very much alike. But this one, the Advantage West Economic Development Group stood apart. Its list of corporate sponsors reads like the

"who's who" list of influential and well-heeled entities, Bankers Branch & Trust, BellSouth, Duke Energy, Grant Thornton, Qualcomm, Spring, UBS, Verizon, Wachovia and other well-known corporations.

□ 1215

The listed funding partners are a very recognizable list as well, at least in Washington: the National Park Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Endowment of the Arts, the U.S. Department of Commerce and, of course, through the virtue of this earmark, the U.S. Congress.

The Advantage West Economic Development Group Web site boasts that publications such as Money, Kiplinger's, Outside, American Style, Modern Maturity and Forbes have ranked western North Carolina as a top destination for living, working, recreation, arts, technology and retirement. That's pretty nice advertisement.

The group highlights the following among other achievements, this group receiving the earmark by the way. During 2005, 2006 the Advantage West Economic Development Group's efforts in the advanced manufacturing sector contributed to economic development announcements of 2,345 new jobs and \$902.5 million in capital investments. That's a lot of money. And they do pretty well here.

The group helped increase the economic impact of tourism in western North Carolina 53 percent since 1995.

I would simply make the point, why in the world, with a group with these kinds of backers in the private sector, does the Federal taxpayer need to turn around and spend \$231,000 of taxpayer dollars?

As I mentioned, there is opportunity cost when you take this money out of the hands of individual taxpayers, send it to Washington, and then let Washington decide who are the winners and who are the losers, who will receive these kinds of economic development earmarks. That's not a very efficient way to distribute money for capital investment. I am glad the sponsor of the earmark is here.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from Arizona, and I appreciate what he is doing.

No Member should ask to spend the people's money if he or she is not willing to come to the people's House and explain his or her request. That is why I'm so pleased to have this opportunity to talk about the good work that Advantage West is doing for the people of western North Carolina.

Communities that have been hit hard with plant closings and job losses have two choices: they can give up or they

can look forward. The partnership between Advantage West and the Federal Government will provide local communities with the tools to make themselves "business ready."

This checklist includes broadband access, access to capital, streamlined permit systems, and cooperation with schools and universities.

This program is a great example of how the government can partner with distressed communities to offer a helping hand instead of a hand-out.

Mr. Chairman, without these types of funding and this type of work with our community, it would be nothing more than us having to give a hand-out. We're asking for a helping hand.

Advantage West has done an outstanding job of working, not only in the 11th District, but the 8th District and the 10th District of North Carolina, being able to help small businesses.

And I might add to my colleagues that 95 percent of new businesses in America today come in small businesses. Here's a situation where the corporations are helping. The community is helping. Our universities, our schools are helping to create these small businesses in our community so a husband and wife can fulfill a dream come true, that they can have the opportunity to purchase their new home and have a business that they can feel proud of and that they too could maybe pass down for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman whose earmark this is. And I also have great fear. I stood in left field when he was at the plate earlier this week in the congressional baseball game, and I'm glad that I didn't have to experience anything hit out there.

But I would simply make the case again. The gentleman mentioned that small business makes up 95 percent of all business starts out there. And I would submit that 99 percent of those do it without any help from the Federal Government at all.

And when the Federal Government does put money out there, I mean, 95 percent, I don't know what percentage but an overwhelming percentage, certainly, without earmark help. But when we do this kind of earmark, we simply pick winners and losers out there. Certain sets of businesses, certain industries, certain individual businesses are helped when others are at a disadvantage because they don't receive that kind of help.

So I would simply say that we shouldn't be doing this as the Federal Government when we have such demand on our scarce budget here for other purposes. And we shouldn't be earmarking for this kind of purpose.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I'm in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. And the

gentleman continues to stay with the theme that these programs can operate without government assistance. Yet, the gentleman, on many occasions, votes, as we all do, for programs where corporate America and other parts of our economic community, of our corporate community, gets help from government in order to put forth their product, in order to put forth their growth.

What my colleague, our freshman colleague is doing, and I compliment him on that, on the fact that as a freshman Member of this House, he already has, obviously, a sense of what his community needs. And this earmark, this modest earmark that he has put in this bill is one to take back to his community and continue to help to build the kind of small business education and information centers that we need.

And so I not only rise in support of it, but I commend the fact that already, at such a short time tenure in this House, he has that full understanding, willing, incidentally, to stand up and defend an earmark, knowing that some people will criticize him for it. But he knows his community better than we do.

And that's my whole point, that there seems to be a prevailing theme that only bureaucrats and Federal agencies, who I support, know how to spend taxpayers' dollars.

Well, no, this is a fine example of a new Member of the House who has a full understanding of his district, who is willing to stand up and defend what is a good earmark. And that's what we should respect, the fact that when we look at the global situation, these Member-driven items are a small amount of dollars, Mr. Chairman, compared to the overall budget.

I mean, I don't want to continue to harp on it, but the kind of money we spend in Iraq, billions, hundreds of billions, of dollars, a lot of that, as we know, unaccounted for, special contracts that went out that we never knew a thing about. Who got rich, who didn't get rich? That's never an issue on the House floor. That's never an issue. A couple hundred thousand dollars to a good community group in North Carolina, that's an issue. Yes, it is an issue. It's a good issue. It's a positive issue. It's the way dollars should be spent.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I support the gentleman's initiative.

I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for the balance of his time.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership and support through this bill and the hard work and dedication that the entire appropriations have put in this.

Once again, I do oppose this amendment. It is a very important piece of the economic structure for the people

of west North Carolina. It gives them an opportunity in small business to create the economic structure that we need.

So many of our jobs, some 78 percent, of the textile industries in the State of North Carolina have been lost. We have to find other ways to create work, and I am so proud of the people of the mountains that they have that never-give-up attitude.

As always, I do appreciate the gentleman's, his hard work and his dedication. And so many times I do agree on so many of the issues, and I commend you for your efforts. Just at this time I would oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX

##### ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Small Business Administration may be used for the West Virginia University Research Corporation for renovations of a small business incubator.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds in the bill from being used to pay for renovations to a small business incubator at West Virginia University.

Like so many of the other organizations listed in the earmark section of this bill, the purpose of this small business incubator is to promote economic development activities by supporting early stage businesses with space, facilities and support services.

The West Virginia University Small Business Incubator is over 5,000 square feet of renovated space in the Chestnut Ridge Research Building on the campus of West Virginia University.

The businesses that are tenants of the incubator program have access to the staff of professionals, trained interns and West Virginia University resources. Businesses receive guidance in the areas of accounting, advertising, graphic design, information technology, finance, corporate services, marketing, Web design and Web development.

That's a lot of advantages they have. I simply don't believe the Federal Government needs to be in the business of helping them further or funding private companies in this way. This is a

form of corporate welfare that so many Members in other settings rail against over and over again.

The National Business Incubator Association is an organization that has 905 member organizations, mostly in the United States. There is certainly no reasonable argument that we should be funding all business incubators in this country. So how do we justify funding just a couple of them in this bill? How are they more deserving of the special treatment that we give them in this bill?

How should I explain to the taxpayers in my district, or other districts, that they're subsidizing business development projects in West Virginia, or any other State for that matter?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for the opportunity to highlight a unique economic development opportunity in my district.

This funding would be used to renovate, as he suggested, a historic glass factory in Star City, West Virginia, just outside Morgantown. This location will serve as a business incubator for start-up artist businesses and will house the West Virginia University ceramics program and the West Virginia University Creative Arts Community Center.

To understand the importance of the project, you have to understand West Virginia. For decades, our economy has been focused on coal, timber and basic manufacturing, and those industries have suffered under unreasonable regulation, free trade agreements and unfair foreign competition.

I've worked hard and will continue to do so to keep those industries strong. But along the way, West Virginians have realized that we also need to diversify our economy to ensure a viable economic future.

Mr. Chairman, that diversification can occur in part by focusing on another sector of our rich history, our cultural history. This earmark provides that opportunity by nurturing new artists and businesses in cooperation with distinguished university programs and will develop Star City and the greater Morgantown area into a destination.

Star City has identified the arts project as an economic development model for the community. And this request responds to the importance the community has placed on redevelopment. I should also note that this Federal investment will be used to leverage funds from the State's Commission on the Arts.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased the committee selected this project. I appreciate their consideration, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the floor about it.

□ 1230

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, again let me just make the point again that there are too many earmarks in this bill that are for business incubators. There are really in many cases earmark incubators. These are earmarks that beget other earmarks. Many are going to organizations that receive additional earmarks or are there for the purpose of receiving additional earmarks. This is one business incubator, and there are hundreds and hundreds of business incubators, 905 in the association. How do we choose to fund just this one? We are picking winners and losers here. We are deciding who is worthy and who is not, and I simply don't think that is fair. It is not a wise use of taxpayer dollars. This business incubator, given the other partners involved, it seems it would be fine without Federal involvement. And I think that we should test that proposition and not fund this earmark.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, part of the argument that the gentleman from Arizona has been making in addition to the ones he has made before is how do we choose this particular program.

Well, that is where the wisdom of the local Member comes in. The Member is asked, is faced with these decisions, and that is how we make them. And, again, it seems to suggest that when grants are handed out at the Federal level, I mean, how many people apply for Federal grants? Hundreds of thousands? Millions? And only a handful get them. We don't question how those grants are handed out. We don't say necessarily that the Federal Government and that agency handed out the wrong grant. It was their decision to hand out that grant. No different, the wisdom used by the Member in his local community, her local community, to understand the needs and ask for a grant, ask for an earmark, and that is what the gentleman from West Virginia has done.

Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, I would like to yield to my colleague and classmate from New York, classmate in the State Assembly (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the chairman of this very important subcommittee, for yielding.

I am very interested in the amendments that Mr. FLAKE is presenting and have been all of the time that he has presented them over the course of the last several years. Mr. FLAKE seems to be devoting his attention towards trying to make sure that as much of the spending in these bills as possible is not being done in a wasteful way, that it is being done appropriately. And if that is the motivation, then I think all of us would certainly appreciate that motivation. But the effects

of the amendments, I think, are questionable.

First of all, basically, under our Constitution and the provision of law, it is quite clear that every Member of this House has a fundamental responsibility, first of all, to represent the people in their congressional district. And most of these earmarks, probably all of them now under the Democratic leadership, which is much more open, are designed to do precisely that, make sure that these budgets address at least to some small degree the needs in each of those congressional districts.

But if Mr. FLAKE and others on the other side of the aisle are truly interested in trying to regulate spending and make sure that it is done properly, I would ask them to focus their attention on other things that really need to be looked at.

For example, this administration is still spending something in the neighborhood of \$8 billion a month in Iraq. We have spent now almost half a trillion dollars there on that illegal, elicit war and continuing disastrous occupation. None of these amendments are focused on that.

Let me just mention a new report by the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which concludes, among other things, that the Bush administration has put forth a shadow government of private companies working under Federal contracts that have exploded in size. Between the year 2000 and 2005, while the Republicans controlled both Houses of the Congress here, procurement spending increased by more than \$175 billion, making Federal contracts the fastest-growing part of the Federal discretionary spending. These huge government contracts are done at the expense of the taxpayers. And in this report, it is made clear that Federal spending by one particular corporation, Halliburton, which, of course, we know is directly connected to Vice President CHENEY, Federal spending to Halliburton increased more than 600 percent between 2000 and 2005.

Now, why aren't our friend on the other side of the aisle focusing their attention on this? We are. We are paying attention to it. We are trying to change the course of this government.

The Government Accountability Office recently found that the government has wasted at least \$2.7 billion on Halliburton contracts which were overpriced contracts or had within them undocumented costs. \$2.7 billion.

So while we are wasting all of this time on these little so-called earmarks where Members of the Congress are trying to do their job for the people they represent, people like Mr. FLAKE are ignoring things like \$2.7 billion in overpayments and undocumented costs to companies like Halliburton. A record level of nearly 40 cents of every discretionary Federal dollar now goes to these private contractors.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious we need a new concentration of attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. DEFAZIO: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new title:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Selective Service System to prepare for, plan, or execute the Area Office Mobilization Prototype Exercise.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, just to kind of give the gentleman good news and make him feel good, we are ready to accept his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I will be brief, given the generosity of the chairman.

This amendment would prohibit the Selective Service from conducting a full-blown nationwide exercise of a mock draft. This House just voted less than 2 years ago, 404-2, against re-institution of the draft. There is no scenario under which the Pentagon, the White House, or this Congress believes we are going to return to a draft. These funds would be wasted with this exercise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we are also prepared to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

None of the funds in this Act to the Small Business Administration may be used for the Abraham Lincoln National Airport Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds from being used for the Abraham Lincoln National Airport Commission in Illinois.

The committee report says that this earmark is providing \$231,000 for this local project. According to the committee report in the letter requesting the earmark, the earmark has been requested by Congressman JACKSON of Illinois for the purpose of "minority and small business development and procurement opportunities."

According to the Web site for this organization, the organization was established by Congressman JACKSON, and the executive director currently is a gentleman by the name of Richard Bryant. Richard Bryant is apparently on the staff of Congressman JACKSON and is his deputy district administrator, according to records. Mr. Bryant has stated this week that he is not paid in his position as executive director of the airport commission and that he is there because of efforts to build a third airport in the Chicago area that is strongly supported by Congressman JACKSON. He also said that the money from the earmark would be used to study ways to make sure that local workers and minorities are hired when and if a new airport is actually built.

Also, Mr. Chairman, according to Mr. JACKSON's Web site, this organization exists to try to promote a third airport in the Chicago area and that last year many of its activities were related to advertising on behalf of that airport. To quote directly from the Web site, and this is from an article published in April of 2006: "Last month the commission called on the south suburbs to donate a total of \$250,000 towards the advertising campaign scheduled to begin June 1." It goes on to say that about \$40,000 is budgeted for billboards. The remaining funds would pay for direct mailings to voters in the region and radio commercials and for yard signs closer to election day.

So it would appear that the activities at least last year of this commission were related to trying to drum up support or actually lobbying on behalf of, or certainly advocating on behalf of, getting public support and, I presume, elected representative support for this airport.

I would also like to point out that there is a press release from Congressman JACKSON dated November 16, 2006, in which he says: "So even with the change of leadership in Congress, I won't pursue Federal funds for the Abraham Lincoln National Airport. Chicago's share of Federal dollars are already committed to O'Hare modernization."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that this earmark does not appear

appropriate; that a Member of Congress directs money to an organization they set up, run by someone who is an employee of the office of that Congressman, and whose purpose appears to be to advocate on behalf of an airport that does not currently exist. If the airport does currently exist or whatever, also, it appears to be in contradiction to the Congressman's own statement as of November of 2006 that he would not pursue Federal funds for this airport in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I understand I have the right to close, and I am the only speaker. So I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I fully understand the gentleman's desire to close, and I am happy to do that. But I believe that he should at least state some of the reasons that he believes this earmark is justified so I can at least have the opportunity to rebut those before he closes. But I am perfectly willing to allow him to have the last word.

I suppose I will anticipate, perhaps, what the gentleman is going to say. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois may suggest that the Ethics Committee has approved that his district employee be the executive director of this commission, and I would take him at his word and assume that is the case.

I don't think that is the issue here. We are talking about over \$200,000 of taxpayers' funds here, and I think the question at issue is whether or not that is an appropriate use of Federal funds and what these Federal funds are going to be used for. If he is suggesting, as some of these reports indicated, that these are going to be spent on minority and business development procurement opportunities for an airport that doesn't yet exist, my question would be how can you have hiring or whatever opportunities for an airport that doesn't exist yet and won't exist even if it were approved today for some number of years?

□ 1245

Is the gentleman willing to say that there will be no further advertising, no further lobbying, no further expenditures of that sort?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

At this time the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from California for offering his amendment and thus for the opportunity to defend



an important project to the people of the State of Illinois and the Nation.

While the gentleman has served two terms in Congress, he has inadvertently entered in a three-decade-old conversation about expanding aviation capacity in Illinois. And his amendment profoundly impacts 12 years of my work in this body.

In fact, the development of a new airport to service the Chicago metropolitan area was first advanced by a well-respected Republican governor, Governor Jim Edgar.

Nationally, aviation is growing at roughly 4 percent, but in the Chicago region it's growing at only 2 percent. Because of capacity constraints at our existing facilities, Midway's runways are too short and O'Hare Airport reached operational capacity 10 years ago and is subject to annual review of capping the number of operations at this facility.

ALNAC is a local airport commission constituted under Illinois State law and comprised of 21 home-rule municipalities in Cook, Will and Kankakee Counties.

ALNAC has created an innovative public-private partnership to design, finance, build and operate a new commercial airport for the Chicago region located near University Park, Illinois.

ALNAC is a legitimate airport commission. In fact, the Governor of the State of Illinois in his State of the State address said specifically, "Congressman Jackson's plan to build the Abraham Lincoln National Airport at Peotone will not compete with O'Hare for needed Federal dollars, meaning the Airport Improvement Program, not small business or financial services problems, but the Airport Improvement Program construction funds.

His plan to use private investment is both a welcomed and innovative way to build an airport. I strongly support it, and I hope you do too."

The Illinois Department of Transportation said that "ALNAC is a local airport authority that was formed through an intergovernmental agreement between its constituent members comprised of 32 Illinois municipalities located in the Chicago region."

The Illinois Department of Transportation says that "ALNAC and its provide partners submitted a comprehensive layout plan to the FAA and to IDOT in July of 2004."

To give you some of the specific examples of the airport layout plan that we submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration that are presently before the FAA for review are under consideration as we await soon a record of decision.

And lastly, the Illinois Attorney General, in her most recent opinion, said that "ALNAC is a legitimate airport commission that only waits for the governor to lease its land to the State of Illinois or to the commission for the purposes of constructing an airport."

This grant allows ALNAC to partner with local universities and/or small

business development centers to conduct a study on how the region can maximize job creation and retention and ensure minority participation for local residents during all phases of the airport project. Specifically, the study will produce recommendations and guidelines and benchmarks to do the following: assure maximum participation for local female, disadvantaged and minority businesses in airport construction and financing operations; identify regional job training needs and relevant job training programs; develop, grow and improve local small business opportunities. Support all aspects of entrepreneurial activities and monitor progress.

The gentleman might ask the question, why now? Many communities in the region have 60 people for every one job. Ford Heights, Illinois, according to Money magazine, is "one of the poorest communities in America" and it abuts the airport, and they deserve to participate in the economic boom that this project will bring.

The Illinois Department of Transportation is in the process of submitting ALNAC's layout plan to the FAA for final approval. IDOT has said that a record of decision could come as quickly as 6 months. If that's true, now is the time to begin planning for local participation in the financing and the construction of this airport.

ALNAC's airport plan, Mr. Chairman, also known as the "Jackson Plan," has been repeatedly endorsed by every major newspaper in Chicago, including the Chicago Tribune, the Chicago Sun Times, the Chicago Daily Defender, the Chicago Daily Southtown. Every major newspaper in the Chicago region, through our very transparent process at the local level, fully appreciates the extent to which for the last 12 years we have invested our time in helping solve the Nation's aviation capacity crisis problem by building a third regional airport.

A 30-year conversation and a 12-year conversation for which I have almost been solely responsible for leading here in the Congress of the United States. In fact, I've been called a one-issue guy in the 12 years that I've been in Congress, and it's focused around this issue.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment. I thank the chairman for his consideration of this earmark. I would strongly encourage Members to vote "yes" on this amendment.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times]

#### NO NEED FOR GREED

Since Rep. Jerry Weller (R-Ill.) is mum about his reasons for tacking to a defense appropriations bill an amendment that would give Will County officials a majority stake in running an airport at Peotone and controlling airport contracts, we can only go along with Rep. Jesse Jackson Jr.'s view that the move is designed to scare off private investors.

If that's indeed the case, then shame on Weller.

It's bad enough to be a Johnny-come-lately, but to act as saboteur on a project that could benefit the entire region is simply out

of line. When few politicians gave Jackson much of a chance to succeed, he staked his career on building a third airport, even forging partnerships across party lines and finding entrepreneurs willing to do the project.

According to Jackson, Will County officials have already been offered five of the nine seats on the commission that would oversee every phase of the airport's development and operation. So what's the problem?

Rather than reach a compromise, Weller appears to be turning to political games to give Will County officials something—exactly what hasn't yet been disclosed. But any proposal that would undermine the work done thus far toward building a third airport should be viewed with a great deal of suspicion.

[From the Chicago Defender, Apr. 15, 2004]

#### CONGRESSMAN JACKSON'S AIRPORT PLAN IS FAR SUPERIOR TO WILL COUNTY'S

On April 12 the Will County airport authority floated its plan for building a South Suburban airport.

Eying the vast economic benefits and potential profits for businesses near a new facility in its area, Will County leaders made it clear why they want to get into the airport business.

Yet a facility to be located at Peotone is a far better idea. It's based on a superior plan, and it would bring 1,000 construction jobs to south Chicagoland by 2006. As envisioned by Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr. (D 2nd), thousands of permanent new jobs would be created after construction if his airport plan were adopted.

It foresees the first scheduled takeoff for a day early in 2009. Based on a Federal Aviation Administration formula that factors in an airport's size and the number of its airport gates, 15,000 permanent jobs would result from Jackson's proposal.

And they would be good, high-paying jobs in industries such as hotels, restaurants, business supply centers and fuel companies.

Tuesday Jackson published an analysis of the differences between proposals for a Will County airport and his South Suburban airport concept. The comparisons are persuasive in favor of his South Suburban Airport Commission plan.

The Will County authority published no financial plan for investment in an airport. Instead, it would rely on financing from federal and state sources, both of which are experiencing severe budget problems. Beyond those unlikely sources of case, Will County officials are hopeful the airlines themselves, most of which are cash strapped, in bankruptcy, or both, would pay part of the costs.

Most objective observers believe that such wishful thinking will end in a simple result: the Will County plan nearly assures its airport will not get built. For one reason, it would compete with O'Hare and Midway airports for federal dollars, a precarious and probably quixotic endeavor, given Mayor Richard Daley's long reach toward Washington money.

Jackson's plan is realistic and sound. It calls for financing by private developers. The Congressman, a plain-talking man, made it plain: "Our plan is wholly financed by private developers, at no cost and at no risk to local taxpayers, federal or state governments, or the airlines."

Two development companies are signed on. They are companies that have built, financed and operated airports in places like New York, Paris and Vancouver. Jackson says they will use the same models they used in those successful airports at the Abraham Lincoln National Airport that his plan calls for at Peotone.

Abraham Lincoln National Airport?

The congressman has formally petitioned the F.A.A. for permission to use that as its



name. His plan calls for dedication of the facility in 2009, the bicentennial of Lincoln's birth.

Jackson says the issue of shared governance with Will County leaders remains negotiable.

But, he says, "Our plan is far better than Will County's. The concept of a self-financing, public-private partnership that shares revenues with surrounding communities in South Cook, Will and Kankakee counties, and that opens by 2009, is a great one. That is not negotiable."

We concur with his approach and ask that a house now divided embrace it, for the good of the entire south Chicagoland area.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EMANUEL

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EMANUEL:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX

##### ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any of the following:

(1) The care, operation, refurbishing, or improvement of the official residence of the Vice President.

(2) Any expenses of the Vice President, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles, official entertainment expenses, and services described in section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and section 106 of title 3, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I offer a simple amendment that bars the executive branch from being used to fund the office that does not exist in the executive branch, the Office of the Vice President.

Last week, we all received a tutorial in U.S. Government history from the Vice President's office. Apparently his office is not an entity within the executive branch.

There have been 46 Vice Presidents in U.S. history, and not one of them knew this or ever claimed this position. Perhaps the Vice President thought he occupied an undisclosed fourth branch of government.

His claim flies in the face of the Constitution and was offered in an attempt to avoid following the rules governing the treatment of classified information and documents. This claim was particularly ironic this week, given the four-part series the Washington Post ran about the Vice President's role in this administration. And rather than claim that he wasn't part of the executive branch, it sounds like, from reading those stories, he is the executive branch.

Yesterday, the Vice President was forced to admit what even an eighth grade student knew, there is no "Cheney branch" of government.

While the Vice President's excuses may change, his desire to ignore the rule remains just as strong as ever. The Vice President is unwilling to risk that the documents detailing the flawed intelligence and faulty assumptions that led us into the war in Iraq. He has been held unaccountable for 6 years, and now he wants to be unaccountable in the historical record.

Whatever his reasons, this penchant for secrecy is not new. Shortly taking office, the Vice President, in meeting with oil and gas executives and not wanting to turn over that information, claimed he was part of the executive branch.

After the Vice President excluded himself from the executive branch, my amendment follows up on the Vice President's assertion and restricts the executive branch funding for the Vice President's office. It leaves intact his Senate presidency office. It delivers two messages. If the Vice President is not in the executive branch, then there is no executive branch office to fund. And perhaps more importantly, it underscores that the Vice President is not above the law and cannot ignore the rules. The law should follow him, whatever branch of government he chooses to hang his hat in.

Mr. Chairman, we have a duty to ensure that no individual in our government, no matter how powerful, is allowed to ignore the rules. And when the Vice President is avoiding accountability, it is the Congress' responsibility to demand that accountability.

The Vice President must know that no matter what branch of government he may consider himself part of on any given day or week, he is not above the law.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman and Members of this body, I am sure that the sponsor thinks he is going to improve the operations of the government, but I think this is probably offered for political purposes.

We cannot deal with the constitutional responsibilities in this bill, and the Vice President does have constitu-

tional responsibilities as President of the Senate. The Senate Legislative Branch appropriations bill provides funding for his salary and legislative operating expenses. In fiscal year 2008, his requests equal \$2.3 million.

I think it's important that I take time to oppose this amendment because it is setting a bad precedent. I think the sponsor must be making an assumption that they will never have a Vice President, because you are setting a precedent here that might come back to haunt you at some time in the future.

The Vice President's office also receives \$4.8 million to fund the executive branch duties of the Vice President and pay for his residence. We decided that, for security reasons, the Vice President needs to have a residence. There was a time that that was not the case. And I don't think that because some Members may not like the current Vice President, or any future Vice President, doesn't mean Congress should use its power of the purse to eliminate funding for the office. That is not how the Founding Fathers envisioned the separation of powers operating.

Eliminating funding to maintain the Vice President's residence and the 25 Federal employees funded by this object is irresponsible. I think it is disrespectful of the Constitution and the Office of the Vice President. Whether we agree or not, the Vice President's office serves an important executive and legislative function.

And let me just say again to my colleagues, this sets a very bad precedent. Where do we stop if we determine that we're going to, by using the power of the purse, pass judgment on the policies of people that serve in government?

It's a political activity. It's a political attempt to embarrass the Vice President. I would hope my colleagues reject this.

Just remember, you may have a Vice President, too. And once you set a precedent, I'm not sure that you would want that to be part of your legacy.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield back his time? The gentleman had moved to strike the last word.

Mr. REGULA. I do claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is permitted to strike the last word and to claim time in opposition.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. And I reserve my time. Just let me say again, this is a bad, bad precedent. And it's an example, you better be careful what you wish for, because you may decide that it's not something you want to happen.

Mr. EMANUEL. I would like to say that it's true, there is an important constitutional precedent here, and that's why the Vice President should never have claimed that he wasn't part

of the executive branch, something any eighth grader knows.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my colleague from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman.

Responding to the gentleman's suggestion that we not do this because we may have a vice president one day, we may have a vice president one day, but that vice president will admit to being vice president. The current Vice President refuses to admit that he is Vice President.

□ 1300

Now, we have heard in Washington flimflam and rope-a-dopes and evasions and half truths. This one takes the cake. This turns the theory of plausible deniability into undeniable irrationality. The Vice President is part of the executive branch. If he is going to state that he is not part of the executive branch, he should act accordingly.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The Vice President has violated a number of rules, maxims, constitutional provisions; but he has clearly violated one that I would have thought him wise enough and old enough to understand. No matter how difficult the situation in which your own misactions have put you, and no matter what kind of a corner you have gotten yourself into, try to avoid saying something that no one will believe.

When the Vice President offered his justification for his refusal to follow the fundamental principle of openness, he made a statement that no one would believe. Apparently, in this case, even he didn't believe him, which was a new reach for him. He is now trying to take it back.

The gentleman from Ohio said to be careful what you wish for. Well, here is what I wish for, I would say to my friend from Ohio: a Vice President of the United States who will follow the law, who will not show contempt for the norms of a democracy.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Representative EMANUEL's amendment to allocate only the budget of the Senate president to Mr. CHENEY. We have known for the Vice President to go to undisclosed locations, but never to an undisclosed branch of government. I turned to my Constitution for some help. It looks to me like article II does include the Vice President in the executive.

The Senate itself seems confused, having subpoenaed Vice President CHENEY yesterday for records on the administration's spying program. The other body doesn't seem to appear to embrace Vice President CHENEY as one

of its own. The Vice President can't have it both ways. This amendment helps him sort it out. We will defund his executive office, leaving him with a vastly reduced budget but giving him what he wants, at least on some undisclosed days.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this is a very interesting and important issue that the gentleman has brought up. I am just thinking, as I had prepared this bill, and sent it over to the executive for a signature, maybe I should declare myself as part of the executive for that period of time and get all the Secret Service protection and all that goes with it. If we start doing that, we could get to a big problem. He brings up an interesting point. It has to be dealt with. The Vice President has to decide if he is part of the Senate or is he a part of the executive branch. We can deal with it later once he tells us what he wants to do.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I support my friend from Illinois' amendment. Everybody, everybody, in our system is accountable. It doesn't matter what you call yourself. It doesn't matter how you define yourself. When it was convenient for him to avoid scrutiny over the energy bill, the Vice President in 2002 said he was a part of the executive branch and preserved by that privilege. When it was inconvenient for the Vice President to comply with everybody else's requirements regarding classified information in 2005 and 2006, he said he was not part of the executive branch, he was part of the legislative branch.

Under our Constitution, what you call yourself does not define your responsibility. What the Constitution says is your responsibility is your responsibility, even if you are Vice President of the United States.

Mr. SERRANO. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman very much for yielding. I thank the Chair of the Democratic Caucus, Mr. EMANUEL, for his amendment, upon which I decided not to offer my amendment on this issue.

Let me explain why I believe that the American people understand that no one is above the law: secret energy task force; secret wiretapping of Americans in violation of the FISA Act; a clandestine campaign to gut critical environmental protections; and new rules developed in secret governing the treatment of foreign terror suspects held by the United States.

The Vice President said he is part of the legislative branch. That means we can expel him. But in this instance, I believe we must say to the American people, he is not above the law.

This is a nonfunding of the Vice President's residence on the basis of

his declaration that he is not part of the executive. I think this is an appropriate vehicle. I think we must say to the American people that not one of us, not one legislator, not one executive person, none of us is above the law. I wholeheartedly support this amendment.

I am proud to join as a cosponsor with my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL, in sponsoring this amendment to H.R. 2829, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2008. I also rise to commend Chairman SERRANO and Ranking Member REGULA for their leadership in shepherding this bill through the legislative process. I declined to offer the amendment that I filed so unity could be exhibited under one premise—no one is above the law—including the Vice President.

Among other things, this legislation provides funding for the Supreme Court and the Federal judiciary, the District of Columbia Government; and several independent agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission. The bill also funds the Executive Office of the President and other executive branch agencies, including the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service.

While most Americans do not know that this legislation also provides funding to operate the official residence of the Vice President, they do know that the Vice President is a member of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. This fact apparently is news to the current occupant of the office, Vice President CHENEY, who it has been reported resisted compliance with an executive order issued by President Bush in 2003 regarding the handling of classified information on the ground that the Vice President and his office is not a unit of the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, if it were not so serious and not part of a long pattern of disturbing conduct, the Vice President's claim would be merely laughable and his weak grasp of the facts might even be charming.

But this Vice President has a long, disturbing, and disastrous record of asserting as fact things that he plainly knows to be untrue.

This is the same Vice President who said this about the war in Iraq: "I think it will go relatively quickly . . . [in] weeks rather than months." In the run-up to the war, this same Vice President went on national television and confidently assured the nation that there was a connection between 911 and Saddam Hussein's Iraq.

Vice President CHENEY proclaimed in March 2002 that Saddam Hussein's Iraq possessed "biological and chemical weapons," and confidently assured the nation less than a week before the launch of the Iraq War that, yes indeed, "we believe [Iraq] has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons." In each instance, the Vice President was proven wrong by the facts.

With his preposterous claim not to be a member of the executive branch, history is repeating. But as the saying goes: "history repeats; the first time as tragedy, the second time as farce."

Indeed, perhaps the only person in the whole history of the United States who has been more wrong more often about more things of great consequence than the Vice President is the current President, who after all, is the nation's Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

Let us set the record straight and get our facts right.

The Vice President is a creature of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government as Article II, section 1 of the Constitution makes clear. The Vice President is not a "member" of the Legislative Branch because membership in that branch is governed by the first clause in sections 2 and 3 of Article I. No member of Congress is elected to serve a four-year term as is the Vice President. And no member of Congress is provided an official residence as is the Vice President and the President.

A member of the Federal legislature can be involuntarily removed from office if his or her colleagues, by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  margin, vote to expel. The Vice President can be involuntarily removed from office after impeachment by the House and conviction in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, the Vice President is extremely intelligent and no doubt knew his claim to be a member of the legislative branch was and is specious. The claim was simply a dodge to evade accountability and compliance with the requirements of the law. We have been down this road before: Secret Energy Task Force, secret wiretapping of Americans in violation of the FISA Act, clandestine campaign to gut critical environmental protections, new rules developed in secret governing the treatment of foreign terrorism suspects held by the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have spent the majority of my time in Congress protecting and defending the separation of powers that is the hallmark of our democracy. I have consistently opposed this Administration's abuse of executive powers and prerogatives. That is why I introduced H.R. 264, the Congressional Lawmaking Authority Protection Act, challenging the president's misuse of bill signing statements.

Similarly, I introduced the Military Success in Iraq Act (MSIA or "Messiah") to deliver American troops from Iraq by terminating the authorization to use military force and requiring a new vote to continue offensive military operations in Iraq. A third example of my resistance to this Administration misuse and abuse of authority is H.R. 267, the Military Commissions Habeas Corpus Restoration Act of 2007, which I introduced to repeal the restriction on the jurisdiction of courts, justices, and judges to hear or consider applications for writs of habeas corpus filed by or on behalf of certain aliens detained by the United States.

Mr. Chairman, no person is above the law and certainly not Vice President CHENEY. That is why I joined with Congressman EMANUEL to resist his latest attempt to avoid accountability and evade responsibility.

The intent of the amendment is straightforward: to limit the availability of funds for the Office of the Vice President only to Vice Presidents who are members of the executive branch of the Federal Government and subject to the executive authority of the President of the United States. The appropriated funds are not available to members of the legislative branch. A person is a member of the legislative branch only if they are so qualified by virtue of compliance with Article I, section 2, clause 1 or Article I, section 3, clause 1. Acting as President over the Senate is not sufficient to make one a "member" of the Senate, and thus a member of the legislative branch.

Although our amendment will save the taxpayers \$4.752 million from being used by the

Vice President, it does not restrict funding for the Vice President's secret service protection and does not affect the funds CHENEY would receive as President of the Senate. The Senate version of the FY08 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill provides the President of the Senate with \$2.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, if the Vice President does not think he is a member of the executive branch there is no reason he should impose upon the taxpayers to fund the perquisites of his office. Democrats were entrusted by the voters with the majority to restore fiscal responsibility, oversight, and accountability to government. The new majority is committed to ensuring that government operates in an open, transparent, accountable and fair manner.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment. Let me again thank Chairman SERRANO and Ranking Member REGULA for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this excellent legislation.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, now that the gentleman from New Jersey has shot down any chance of me being part of the executive branch, reminding me that the Constitution doesn't allow it, I will just keep quiet on that and yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), our caucus chairman.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to make two closing points really quickly to my colleague from Ohio, if I can: one is I don't come to this amendment lightly. The Vice President's unprecedented act of declaring that he was not in the executive branch is the reason I submitted this.

To the second point, you had said, we may have a Vice President. Having worked in the executive branch, Vice President CHENEY is the Vice President of all of us. He is not yours. He is all of ours. That is why all of us were outraged by the position that he took that he was not part of the executive branch so he can avoid accountability. He is the Vice President of all of us. We ask him to abide by the law, to understand that when there is a rule in place that he is accountable and responsible to that, both for the historical purposes and when it relates to national security matters. That is why all of us were outraged when he made the decision to keep his meetings with oil executives secret.

At every step of the way, he has chosen secrecy over sunshine; obstruction over accountability. We would ask seriously that the Vice President operate with that seriousness.

We didn't come to this lightly. He took an unprecedented step. It is not one we would have done gingerly, messing with his office. But I want to remind everyone here, the reason we are speaking up is because he is our Vice President. We would like him to act accordingly, in the office that he has and the responsibilities that come with the office.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the gentleman is correct. This is a very serious matter. This administration, this Vice President, whether

on torture, whether on prisons, whether on their behavior in spying on Americans, has told us over and over that they are above the Constitution. What this says is that they are not above the Constitution. No one is. The Vice President certainly is not.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Number one, of course, you are going to abolish the residence. I assume you are going to get a Katrina trailer to provide for the Vice President, since we historically have provided housing and you don't offer any substitute for the existing residence. So I would think you would want to give that some thought.

Secondly, we have elections. This is not the place to establish an amendment to the Constitution or to define what you may or may not like about the operation of the Vice President's office.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the distinguished whip.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Vice President is a talented man. He is a former Member of this body, a former whip of this body. I would like to think that any former whip of the body or current whip could confuse people as much as the Vice President appears to be able to do.

Certainly my good friend from Illinois is a smart man. He knows what branch of government the Vice President is a part of. There are only three, after all. We know he is not part of the judiciary. We know he is not part of the legislative. So he must be part of the branch that is funded in the bill.

This amendment may be lots of things, but it is not a serious amendment about really defunding the Vice President's office. It is an amendment about something other than that, and we know it. It has nothing really to do with moving this issue forward. There will be some discussion as the day goes on today about whether or not an amendment on our side was really an important part of the debate on the bill.

This amendment is an amendment in search of a press release. In fact, let me take that back. This amendment is an amendment that is following a press release. We have already had the press release. We have already had the comments to the press about how we take advantage of a moment about who has access to what records. We all know that defunding the Vice President's office is not the way to do that.

□ 1315

I was glad to hear my friend from Illinois say in his concluding remarks, or what I believe would have been his concluding remarks, I may find that was not right, is we understand the Vice President of the United States is our Vice President, we understand that his office is funded under this bill, and we

understand that is the work that needs to be done by the Congress. We know what branch of government he belongs to. No matter how confusing that may seem, there are only three. We know which one he is part of.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield for a short question for the whip?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois to ask a short question of the whip.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, question number one to the minority whip, I would say to you that, of course, there are three branches of government. I don't think anybody in room or in the Chamber needs that explanation. It is the Vice President's lawyer that needs that explanation.

Second, you do believe if he is in the Vice President's office, he should observe all the laws and regulations that come with that as it relates to the responsibility of that office.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield, based on the gentleman's time on the topic we are discussing, my personal view is that the Vice President and the President are bound by the same standards. But that is only my personal view. And, after all, we are not the judicial branch of government. Which branch of government would we be? The legislative branch. We know where the Vice President's office is. We know what branch he belongs to.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a debate, not a legitimate debate, about whether or not the Vice President is in one branch or the other. After all, he presides over the U.S. Senate. So if we did not decide to put the funding into this particular appropriations bill, we would have to put it in the other.

This is a raw grab for power to defund an essential constitutional office, and it is wrong. And if it even comes close to passing, if it is not on a bipartisan basis defeated, the gentleman from Illinois will, in fact, have undercut the very underpinnings of the Constitution.

This is an important vote. It is an important vote because how dare we, how dare we use a maneuver like this, to try to stifle any constitutional officer, including our own.

I am ashamed to belong to a branch that would even consider this, and I am ashamed that the gentleman would do such a thing.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census, and National Archives, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL.

In light of recent events, in which various Executive Branch officials, including the Vice President's former Chief of Staff, I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, have acted with reckless dis-

regard for the protection of classified information, I applaud Mr. EMANUEL's leadership in introducing this amendment.

This amendment would eliminate funding for the Office of the Vice President in light of the Vice President's refusal to comply with Executive Order 12958.

Executive Order 12958, as amended by President Bush in March 2003, requires the Information Security Oversight Office, ISOO, within the National Archives and Records Administration to establish a uniform system to protect classified national security information throughout the Executive Branch.

In 2004, the Office of the Vice President refused to submit to an on-site inspection. In doing so, it made the astonishing claim that it was not an Executive Branch entity and therefore not covered by the Executive Order.

The director of the ISOO wrote the Vice President's office to contest the claim and also asked the Department of Justice to evaluate the Vice President's argument. The Vice President and the Justice Department repeatedly ignored these communications. Moreover, we learned this week that the Vice President's staff has proposed amending the Executive Order to eliminate the ISOO.

Congress should not tolerate this effort by the Vice President to exempt his office from oversight and retaliate against the agency charged with maintaining our Nation's most sensitive secrets.

The Vice President is making a mockery of the law and our system of checks and balances.

If the Office of the Vice President insists upon defining itself as not being an Executive Branch entity, then clearly it should not be funded like one.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address this important issue—accountability.

All of us in government service have an obligation to be accountable for our actions and we all take an oath to follow the laws of this country.

Unfortunately, it appears the Vice President believes he should be held to some different standard that applies only to him.

The news that the Vice President as advanced a legal argument that he is not a part of the executive branch and not a part of the legislative branch but has some special status which means he does not have to comply with Executive Orders or the law in safeguarding classified material is nothing less than shocking.

As a member of the House Intelligence Committee I can report to my colleagues that if we stand by and allow the Office of the Vice President to exempt itself from the same rules that apply to any employee in our intelligence services, we will deal a serious blow to the morale of these patriotic Americans defending our country.

I will therefore support every measure in this Financial Services Subcommittee bill, at every step in the process as it becomes law to compel the Vice President to follow the law of the land.

The Vice President should be leading by example. He should be setting the highest standards of conduct and accountability.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the FY08 House

Appropriations Financial Services Subcommittee bill. As you know, this will be the first of the 11 bills that the House Appropriations Committee have considered that will have all of its earmarks in it as it first comes to the floor; and one in which all of its earmarks are publicly disclosed. We have ushered in a new era in Congress, and it is an era of which I am proud.

I have attended all of the hearings the subcommittee has had this Congress, and have enjoyed my work not only with Chairman JOSÉ SERRANO, but with his staff of Dale Oak, Bob Bonner, Frank Carrillo, Karyn Kendall, and Deborah Bilek. We have had to make many difficult decisions. But I am proud to say that we have been able to make some major accomplishments. Among them include: CDFI/Bank Enterprise Fund—\$54,000,000.

Along with Chairman SERRANO, we were able to get an increase for funding for both the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, CDFI, and the Bank Enterprise Fund. Both of these programs are of vital importance to our Nation's urban areas, and help improve access to a wider array of financial services in distressed communities. Fourteen million dollars of this fund is to go to the Bank Enterprise Fund.

#### II. SBA MICROLOAN PROGRAM AND MICROLOAN TECHNICAL SUPPORT—\$17,000,000

Small businesses are the engine that drives the American economy. This supports funding of the Small Business Administration's Microloan program and technical support for the microloan program of the SBA. The microloan program will receive a total of \$17 million (\$2.5 million for loan subsidies and \$14.5 million for technical assistance). The President's budget proposed to terminate technical assistance and to provide no subsidy for microloans.

I am also pleased that we were able to get report language that emphasizes and enhances the role of the Federal Communications Commission toward ensuring that all ethnic minorities, senior citizens and the disabled will not have blank television sets when the whole country goes from an analog signal to totally digital signals on February 17, 2009. Also, we were able to ensure that the Department of the Treasury step up their enforcement of companies that use predatory mortgages and loans on senior citizens, ethnic minorities, and the disabled. Not only do we have language in the report that emphasizes this need, we provide these agencies with the funding they need to do what America needs done.

Finally, I want to discuss one area of particular interest to me. The bill, under its section regulating the District of Columbia, has a cap on what attorneys can bill for families of disabled children who need assistance under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or IDEA. No where else in our country is this the case. This is a shame. During subcommittee and full committee consideration of the bill, I wanted to offer an amendment to remove this section. However, my staff and I have been working with Mayor Adrian Fenty, and will not advocate the removal of the provision this fiscal year. Mayor Fenty agrees with me that this provision should be removed; by the next fiscal year, language that does the least amount of harm to the citizens of the District of Columbia and which enhances the quality of life for all disabled children and their

families should be completed. I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter dated June 26, 2007 that I received from Mayor Fenty addressing this problem, which will follow my remarks.

I would like to say one word about earmarks. What has been missed in this debate is the fact that in this bill, like most of the bills that have come to the floor with earmarks, a good number of these earmarks are earmarks requested by the President. This bill contains \$1.3 billion worth of earmarks specifically requested by the President for a wide variety of projects throughout the nation, mainly for projects by the General Services Administration. It seems to me to be hypocritical for the minority to have so much energy to criticize the earmarks of other Members of Congress, especially those of us in the Majority, while offering not even a hint of outrage at the earmarks offered by the President.

This subcommittee covers over 700 individual agencies. We have so much authority, the Chairman has to give us cards with what it is over which we have jurisdiction. It is my desire that we can keep all amendments to this, and the rest of the bills that my colleagues and I have been working so hard on the House Appropriations Committee, to a minimum; that these bills move as quickly as possible through the House and Senate; and that President Bush signs these bills into law so that we can continue to work for the American people.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,  
Washington, DC, June 26, 2007.

Hon. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KILPATRICK: I write today on an issue of great importance to my city, and about which I understand you have a particular interest—that is, inclusion by Congress of a cap on the amount of attorneys' fees that can be paid by the District of Columbia government in special education cases in our annual appropriations bill.

As you know, I opposed the cap when I was a member of the City Council, and, in principle, I continue to oppose the cap as a matter of policy. However, as Mayor, I am obligated to protect the fiscal health of the city, which was in such dire condition for a number of years in the 1990s that Congress intervened by creating the Financial Control Board, and I take that responsibility to my constituents very seriously. As part of that intervention, Congress also created an independent Chief Financial Officer for the District, who is required to certify that the District's local funds budget is balanced each year before it is sent to Capitol Hill. My FY08 budget has been certified by the CFO.

In order to meet the deadlines of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, as well as the Federal Office of Management and Budget, the District's local budget is normally developed a full year before Congress takes final action on it in the fall (or, as was the case last year, after the new fiscal year has begun). When a new mayor is elected, modifications to that budget are made during the transition and in January to reflect his or her priorities. Nevertheless, the District's local budget for FY08 was completed months before the potential for the attorneys' fee cap to be eliminated was raised in Congress. As a result, the budget that I submitted to the Council, and that was approved by that body in early June, does not include the multi-million dollar increase in attorney payments that the Dis-

trict would be required to pay if the cap is lifted this year.

I am deeply committed to improving the entire public education system in the District, so that every child in this city has the opportunity to reach his or her potential, in terms of personal fulfillment and financial independence. That desire extends one hundred . . . June 14, and I appointed a new chancellor, Michelle Rhee, on that same day. A key area that I identified when I hired her as one where significant progress must be made in her first year on the job was special education.

However, the improvements to the special education system that must be made to reduce the number of students and parents who are unsatisfied with the system and seek legal recourse as a result cannot be made overnight. In addition, because our local budget for FY08 is completed, if the cap is lifted now, we would have to reprogram much needed funds from other areas of the schools budget to cover the expected increase in attorneys' fees. For these reasons, I am asking that you allow the fee cap to remain in place for the coming fiscal year—so that, with the Council's help, I have the opportunity to develop a budget for FY09 that assumes removal of the fee cap, prospectively, and accounts for the cost of that policy change. At that point, I can assure you that I would support removal of the fee cap for special education cases brought after the beginning of that fiscal year.

I greatly appreciate your consideration of this request and would be happy to discuss the matter with you further at your convenience. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to share my views on the policy, as well as its fiscal impact, with you.

Sincerely,

ADRIAN M. FENTY,  
Mayor.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, over the past week, the country did a collective double-take, as one commentator said, when they heard that Vice President CHENEY does not believe he is part of the executive branch. That's why Representative EMANUEL has proposed his amendment today.

This issue first came to the public's attention last week when I wrote to the Vice President asking why he blocked efforts by the National Archives to conduct security inspections of his office, as required by the President's own executive order. The response was that the Vice President's office was not an entity within the executive branch.

Legal experts ridiculed this argument, and late-night comics got some good new material. But the Vice President's extreme aversion to any oversight whatsoever, by Congress or even by his own Administration, is not a laughing matter.

The Vice President has claimed special privileges that even the President doesn't have. The Vice President has unilaterally claimed an absolute exemption from inspections, while other White House offices comply with the executive order. Take the National Security Council, which is an entity within the White House. It had the wisdom to allow an inspection.

The fact is, until the Vice President took this unprecedented stance, nobody at the White House had ever blocked any security inspections by the Archives.

And this is not the only time the Vice President has acted to prevent oversight. He went to court to stop GAO from examining the actions of his energy task force. He blocked the Secret Service from disclosing visitors to his

residence. In fact, he even refused to provide information to Congress about his employees for the annual Plum Book.

His argument is—and I quote—"The Vice Presidency is a unique office that is neither a part of the executive branch nor a part of the legislative branch, but is attached by the Constitution to the latter." Even school children know this is preposterous.

The reality is that since 2002, there's been no oversight, no monitoring, and no reporting in the Vice President's office. That's an invitation to exactly the kind of leaks and criminal violations that have occurred in Mr. CHENEY's office. We are a government of laws and rules, not arbitrary decrees.

The Vice President can't unilaterally decide he is his own branch of government and exempt himself from important, commonsense safeguards for protecting classified information. And he can't insist he has the powers of both the executive and the legislature branches, but the responsibilities of neither. The Vice President is not above the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

None of the funds in this Act to the Small Business Administration may be used for the Wittenberg University East Asian Study Center.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds in the bill from being used for the Wittenberg University East Asian Study Center. The committee report provides there will be \$500,000 spent on this local project.

Now, Wittenberg University is a private college. On all these earmark things that I am bringing up and that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) has brought up, it is not an issue of whether this is a good university, I am sure it is a great university; or whether this is a worthy, charitable endeavor, I am sure it is a worthy, charitable endeavor. It is a question of whether or not it is appropriate for taxpayers' funds.

On the last amendment that I had talked about, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) made a very eloquent report of why he believes there should be a third airport in Illinois. But that really wasn't the point, as to whether there should be a third. I am not qualified. I don't know whether there should be a third airport in Chicago or not.

The point was, is it appropriate to use Federal taxpayer funds to fund an organization that you set up that is for the purpose of basically applying political pressure to create this airport when it doesn't exist. I think that is clearly not appropriate.

In this case here, this is to be used "for the development of an undergraduate interdisciplinary program in international business, with a focus on the field of experience in Asia."

According to the Web site, this East Asian Studies Journal has existed for 27 years. This is the 27th consecutive annual edition of this particular publication. So this center, it would appear, has existed for 27 years in this university.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is actually a Lutheran university. I am on the board of advisors of a Lutheran university in my district. I think they do very fine things. I just don't think it is appropriate to use taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. First of all, let me thank the chairman and the ranking member for putting together a good bill. I appreciate the hard work they have done on this bill and on approving this earmark.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike \$500,000 in funding to support the expansion of the East Asian Studies and International Business Program at Wittenberg University in my hometown of Springfield, Ohio.

This program will give Wittenberg business students the cultural background and hands-on experience they need to compete in the increasingly competitive global marketplace. It achieves this by providing college students a curriculum in which they can learn about Asian language, religion and cultures. This understanding is vital to establishing business relationships, especially abroad. This is an expansion of the program. In the past, this has been truly just a learning experience in an intellectual way, not focused on business.

They will immerse themselves in these programs while working for overseas companies through internships and study-abroad programs. In fact, in 1999, James Scott of Yale University and Timothy Cheek of Colorado College wrote that Wittenberg is unique among liberal arts schools in the accomplishments and intellectual breadth of its East Asian Studies pro-

gram. No other peer school can offer such a distinguished curriculum, covering language, religion, classical civilizations, philosophy, history and the culture of all the major East Asian civilizations.

These business outreach programs are of enormous importance, as the global marketplace dramatically increases competition while rendering borders irrelevant. According to the United States Census Bureau foreign trade statistics, U.S. trade with China and Japan, the United States' second and fourth largest trading partners respectively, amounted to over \$550 billion in 2006, representing approximately one-fifth of our total foreign trade.

I am confused, Mr. Chairman, on this amendment, because there is no reason really to oppose this program at this time, because we owe it to our students to equip them with every advantage as they prepare to face the challenges and opportunities of the global job market of the 21st century.

One of these tools we can offer our students is the opportunity to study abroad. The Institute For International Education of Students conducted the first large-scale survey exploring the lasting impact of study abroad programs on students' personal, professional and academic lives. The survey of IES alums found that experiences abroad positively affected their outlook and career choices and remained essential in their lives, even after graduation.

One of the most compelling reasons to fund business study abroad programs is to train future global commercial leaders to be more effective in operating in an increasingly interconnected world, taking into account foreign and international political and economic systems.

The IES survey found that 97 percent of the respondents said studying abroad increased their maturity; 96 percent reported improved self-confidence; 89 percent played a better role in their ability to handle uncertainty; and 95 percent stated their experience had lasting impacts on their worldwide view.

Mr. Chairman, before I entered public service, I was a small businessman. I can tell you there have been numerous occasions where my understanding, or lack thereof, of the background and experience of the person sitting across the table would have helped me much better in negotiating some of the things that I negotiated. A number of those people were from around the world. A better understanding of that, a better intellectual capability.

Expanding this program will help this small university in my district present a better challenge to the students that are there.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone to be opposed to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I will just say that the cer-

tification actually says the funding will be used for the establishment of a center. Perhaps that is in error.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I didn't select that language used in that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. It says for the establishment of a center. Whether it is the establishment or the expansion, I just respectfully suggest that this is more in the nature of support for a university rather, than support for a project which has a Federal nexus and requires Federal tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOBSON. In closing, I would just say that I think this is an effective use of dollars to enhance these young people's education, give them the ability to improve the economy in this country, and I would urge everyone to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, it was the understanding of all parties that there would not be a recorded vote on this motion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the vote on this amendment and revote it de novo.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman clarify what it is he is asking for?

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to clarify it for my friend the chairman.

I am simply asking that the voice vote which was taken be vacated and that we retake the vote de novo. It is my hope that after so doing, we will be able to avoid a roll call.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi that the voice vote be vacated to the end that the question be put de novo?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the following:



Abraham Lincoln National Airport Commission  
 Adelante Development Center  
 Advantage West Economic Development Group  
 Alleghany Highlands Economic Development Corporation  
 ARISE Foundation  
 Career Center for the Northeast Central Ohio Bioscience Consortium  
 Barracks Row  
 Barry University for the Institute for Community and Economic Development  
 Ben Franklin Technology Partners  
 Boston Chinatown Neighborhood Center Workforce Development Initiative  
 Bridgeport Regional Business Council  
 Bright Beginnings, Inc.  
 Bronx Council on the Arts  
 Brooklyn College's Entrepreneurial Center  
 Buffalo Niagara International Trade Foundation  
 California State University, Pasadena Biotech Training Facility  
 Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce and Industry  
 Catalyst, Washington, DC  
 Center for Economic Growth, Greene County, NY  
 Center for Inspired Teaching  
 Center for Women and Enterprise  
 Belvedere Business Park Project, City of Charlotte, NC  
 Angela Rudolph, Assistant to the Mayor, Chicago, IL  
 Grow Inglewood, City of Inglewood, CA  
 Adams-LaBrea Retail Project, City of Los Angeles, CA.  
 Colorado State University, Sustainable Biofuels Development Center  
 Columbus College of Art and Design  
 Community College of Philadelphia  
 Connected Technologies Corridor  
 Cuyahoga Community College  
 Dartmouth Regional Technology Center  
 Detroit Economic Growth Corporation  
 Detroit Renaissance  
 DuPage Technology Park  
 Earth Conservation Corps  
 Eastern Market, Washington, DC  
 Economic Development Coalition of Southeast Michigan  
 Entrepreneurial Development Center, Inc., Cedar Rapids, IA  
 Everybody Wins!  
 Excel Institute  
 Purdue Technology Center of Northwest Indiana  
 Experience Works, Inc., Richmond VA  
 Experience Works, Arlington, VA  
 Fairplex Trade and Conference Center  
 Federal HUBZone Incubator, Elizabeth City, NC  
 Friends of the Big South Fork  
 Greater Harlem Chamber of Commerce  
 Greater North Louisiana Community Development Corporation  
 Greystone Foundation  
 Hispanic Information and Telecommunications Network  
 Historic Congressional Cemetery  
 Valley Economic Development Center  
 Howard University College of Dentistry  
 Hudson Alpha Institute  
 Illinois Institute of Technology  
 Indiana State University, Center for New Business Development  
 Inquilinos Boricuas en Accion  
 Institute for Advanced Learning and Research  
 International Youth Service and Development Corps  
 John C. Calhoun Community College  
 Johnson and Wales University  
 Johnstown Area Regional Industries Incubator and Workforce Development  
 Kulanu Vocational Education Program  
 LaGuardia Community College

Lewis and Clark State College  
 Lorain County Community College  
 Louisiana Small Business Development Center  
 Louisville Medical Center Development Corporation  
 Macomb County Department of Planning and Economic Development  
 Marshalltown Community College  
 Office of Workforce Development, Medina County, OH  
 MenzFit, Washington DC  
 Mifflin County Industrial Development Corporation  
 Mississippi State University  
 Mitchell County Development Foundation, Inc.  
 Montana State University  
 Montana World Trade Center  
 Montgomery College  
 National Association of Development Organizations  
 National Federation of the Blind  
 New College Institute  
 North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center  
 North Dakota State College of Science, Nanotechnology Applied Science Laboratory  
 North Iowa Area Community College  
 North Side Industrial Development Company  
 Northeast Entrepreneur Fund  
 Northwest Agriculture Business Center  
 Northwestern University  
 Ohio University  
 Oil Region Alliance of Business  
 Operation New Hope, Florida  
 Peoria NEXT Innovation Center  
 Phoenix House  
 Portland State University  
 Ready to Work, Ohio  
 Rio Hondo College  
 Rochester Tooling and Machining Association  
 Rock Valley College  
 Rockford Area Ventures Small Business Incubator and Technology Commercialization Center  
 Rockland Small Business Development Center  
 Rowan University  
 San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association  
 Sandoval County New Mexico  
 Seedco Financial Services Alabama Minority and Women-owned Business Enterprises  
 Southern and Eastern Kentucky Tourism Development Association  
 Sephardic Angel Fund, Brooklyn, NY  
 SER—Jobs for Progress National  
 Shawnee State University  
 Sierra College  
 Sitar Arts Center  
 Soundview Community in Action  
 South Dakota School of Mines  
 South Side Innovation Center  
 Southeastern University  
 Spanish American Merchants Association  
 St. Jerome's Church Community Center  
 STEED Youth Program  
 University of Northern Iowa  
 TechRanch Technology Venture Center  
 Enterprise Center, Tennessee  
 Illinois Institute of Technology  
 University of Texas, San Antonio  
 Thomas More College  
 Thurgood Marshall College Fund  
 University of Connecticut, Avery Point  
 University of Maryland  
 University of Missouri, Kansas City  
 University of Notre Dame, Robinson Enterprises Community Learning Center  
 University of Pittsburgh  
 University of South Florida  
 University of Southern Maine  
 Lewiston-Auburn College  
 University of Texas, Brownsville International Trade Center

Urban League of Rochester  
 USS Saratoga Museum Foundation  
 Valley Economic Development Center  
 Vermont Small Business Development Center  
 Wallace State Community College  
 Department of Public Services, Wayne County, MI  
 Wayne County, New York  
 West Virginia University Research Corporation  
 Western Massachusetts Enterprise Fund  
 Williamsburg County, SC  
 Wittenberg University  
 Workforce Initiative Association, Canton, OH  
 Youngstown Edison Incubator Corporation  
 Youngstown Central Area Community Improvement Corps  
 Youngstown Warren Relational Chamber

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, here, because this is an amendment that he suggested right here on the floor of the House on June 13, earlier this month.

During debate that evening, which was the evening in which it was decided that we would make earmarks public and that they would be included in the bill, Mr. OBEY said, "I want to make clear, I hate the earmarking process. I absolutely detest it."

Further on in his comments, the gentleman from Wisconsin said, "And I am going to be very interested in seeing which Members vote for the amendment that I intend to attach to every appropriations bill which would call for a total elimination on earmarks. I want to see how many of you actually vote for it." Well, I want the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to know that I agree with his comments.

In the previous bill that we had before this House yesterday, the Interior bill, this amendment did not show up. So I took it upon myself to offer this amendment, which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee had suggested that he was going to offer on every appropriations bill. So that is, in fact, the amendment that I have offered.

What this amendment would do, Mr. Chairman, is it would strike all 148 earmarks that are currently in this bill from the bill, and thereby would save \$33.71 million of taxpayer money.

I hope that the chairman will support me in this effort. Obviously I am offering this amendment. I intend to vote for this amendment, and I hope the good chairman of the Appropriations Committee would join me in this offering and in voting for it as well.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.



Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is using a very interesting approach. He was part of a group that spent time questioning how we presented earmarks. At that time, we had already, under the leadership of Mr. OBEY, come forth with a proper plan where transparency was the order of the day, where vetting each program, each request, was the order of the day. But that was not enough for the gentleman. It was not enough for the group that stood here day after day badgering us about earmarks.

Now the approach is to say that notwithstanding the fact that the earmarks are part of a very open process, that notwithstanding the fact that there is a new day in how we handle earmarks, that notwithstanding the fact that we have cut earmarks by 50 percent, notwithstanding any of that, no earmark is good and all earmarks should disappear.

What is sad about that is that is not what we were originally presented with. We were not presented with that. We were presented with a belief that we had to do things differently. Notwithstanding the fact that the chairman, Mr. OBEY, already had proposed a plan that was totally different from the past. They felt that it should be better or different or colored different, or whatever.

Now they want no earmarks. Well, people should be reminded that Member projects have been vetted through each Member's office. I have said over and over again that Members know the needs of their districts and Members know how to present an earmark through the committee staff to committee leadership.

Second, every item has been reviewed by the Appropriations Committee. The staff has taken long hours on both sides working in a bipartisan fashion to look at all requests and come up with the final list. We looked at your requests and you looked at our requests. We both looked at all of them. That is how we came to this. So we are pretty sure that everybody's concerns are taken into account here.

Members who sponsor these projects believe that they are worthy and that the taxpayers' money is being well spent. Again, whenever an agency spends money on giving out a grant to a community group, we don't have a discussion on the House floor, we don't have discussions on talk shows on TV or radio discussing those grants.

Billions of dollars are given out every year by the Federal Government to local groups and local projects, everything from building highways to supporting local initiatives. There is no discussion of that.

□ 1330

There is no oversight of that as such. But here, when a Member decides that he or she knows what is good for their district, we have to attack it. But

again, the important point to note here as far as making an argument is that the argument was made that the process was not right, notwithstanding Mr. OBEY having changed the system. Now we are being told that no matter what we do, the earmark is just not good.

I wonder if the gentleman is going to be supported by all other Members of his party who asked this chairman in writing for earmarks and were granted those earmarks. I wonder how they feel about this, and if they agree with you that all earmarks are bad.

Overall we have a diversity of projects in this bill. They touch urban and rural America, all regions of the country, women and minorities, as well as both sides of the aisle. We have technical assistance for start-up businesses, technology training, business attraction programs, small business incubators and job skills development. Members of this House have been able to identify many commendable projects.

The projects that the amendment's proponent is targeting are important projects to those Members and those communities.

I would say to the gentleman to really rethink this approach. If this approach is, with all due respect to him, a message for the 6:00 news, fine, I can't argue with that. You have done well, you have won on that issue.

This is really about saying that each individual colleague that surrounds you on your side and on this side does not know what is best for their district and that the process that we used to come to this point is a process that does not take into account everything that we could be worried about. Also, that it is not a process that has allowed Members to put forth their vision and at the same time have committee staff and other Members check to make sure. This may come as a shock to some Members, but there were projects where we felt either the vision or in some cases even the title had to be dealt with because we didn't want to do the wrong thing and we certainly didn't want to embarrass anyone. We did not accept every single project.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Points I want to make; First of all, we have reduced the level of earmarks.

Number two, our title is Representative to the Congress. As such, we have a responsibility to represent the needs of our districts. Earmarks provide a vehicle to do that.

Third, earmarks if you follow them through, are great generators of private investment. It certainly happened in my district. A lot of good things get done because we have the stimulus of an earmark.

Fourth, we have a right to decide the priorities of our district. We are better equipped to do that than somebody in the bureaucracy and in the executive branch. Constitutionally, we have the

responsibility to make policy. Their job is to execute policy downtown.

Fifth, Congress has a transparent and open process. This is the result of the efforts of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. That was the discussion we had. We have accomplished that. This is why the gentleman from California can question this earmark, earmarks generally, because we have a transparent process. People know what the earmark is, what it does, and who sponsored it. We have had Member after Member come in and defend their earmarks today, and that is the way it should be. If you eliminate the earmarking process, you move it solely to the administration, and where is the transparency in the administration; or, we revert to the old days where a few people in conference were adding projects with very little opportunity for the Members of the body to look at them or challenge them.

I would think that the gentleman from California would be pleased that we have the transparency that is part of this and allows him or others to question earmarks. I think those who put in the earmarks have to be prepared to defend the validity of what they have offered. So this is a good process, and this is a result of our discussion.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, we did fight hard for this transparency, and I am glad we have this transparency. But the reason we have it is not simply to rubber-stamp every earmark that the Chairs of committees decide in their judgment to put in.

Let me quote again the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, on June 13, 2007. He said, "The reason I hate earmarks is because they suck everybody in. They suck them into the idea that we have to be ATM machines for our districts."

Mr. Chairman, I don't think we want to be ATM machines for our districts. This amendment which has been suggested by Mr. OBEY, I don't believe he or certainly I necessarily think that all 148 of these are bad. However, if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee believes as he said, "I hate the earmarking process, I absolutely detest it," then maybe we should start to reform it. This is a way to reform it. This is a way to change it. Let's just take them all out for now, and let's talk about a way that perhaps something can be done in a way in which we are not ATM machines for our districts.

By the way, by doing that, we will save the taxpayers \$33.7 million, which I would imagine they will be able to use in their pockets in their districts as they want to and I would argue in a better, more effective way than we will, even though we represent them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to lay out the context for this debate. Here is the record of our Republican friends when they controlled the House on the question of earmarks. In the last year that our party controlled the House before the Republicans took over, if you take the largest four domestic appropriations bills, there was a total of less than 800 earmarks in those bills. In the last year of the Republican regime in those same bills, there were more than 8,000. That's a thousand percent increase.

In the Labor-Health appropriation bill, the last year I was chairman there were zero earmarks in that bill. The last year that earmarks were considered in the Labor-Health bill under the Republican leadership, there were over 3,000 earmarks.

In addition, earmarks were used for internal blackmail. On one occasion, every Democrat who voted against the Labor-Health-Education bill because it insufficiently funded education and health and job training saw their earmark projects eliminated in retaliation, and I called that at the time internal blackmail.

It was then that I had my staff prepare the first analysis of the growth of earmarks during Republican control of this House.

In addition, we saw earmarks used in order to change votes on Medicare part D, that famous night where the roll call was held open for 3 hours while promises were made in order to turn enough votes around to turn a defeat into a victory for that program.

After the Cunningham affair, our Republican friends announced they were going to attach the names of requesters to the earmarks. But they conveniently declined to make that effective on their watch. So when we came in, the first thing we did was to implement that proposal and require that names be attached to earmarks.

The second thing we did was to impose a moratorium on earmarks until we could straighten out the process.

The third thing we did was announce that we were going to cut them by 50 percent for the appropriate accounts, the nonproject accounts.

The fourth thing we did was to require a certification to make clear that no one had a financial interest in the earmarks that they were seeking.

Then we also provided that, unlike 2 years ago, no provision would be able to be put into a conference report without having a vote on the final product of that conference report by the conferees. That's what we did.

Now the gentleman is making a Federal case out of the fact that I had wanted more time to screen these earmarks which have grown exponentially in order to protect the House from bad choices. Folks on his side of the aisle objected to that, and so we relented and so we now have earmarks in the bill. And now the gentleman is squawk-

ing because we have earmarks in the bill just as loudly as he was squawking when we didn't. He's a very hard fellow to please.

Now, what I said a week ago was that I detest the earmark process, and I do. Why? For a number of reasons. Because it requires me as a conscientious chairman of this committee to spend a huge amount of my time simply reading through those things to try to make certain that the House is not embarrassed.

But the more fundamental reason I am frustrated by the process is because it makes so many Members focus so exclusively on the issue of earmarks that we never get a debate on policy, and I thought we came here to debate policy. And that's my problem. I don't think earmarks are evil. I think Members of Congress have a perfect constitutional right to request specific funding for a specific project, just as the executive branch does. And I would remind you that the executive branch directs eight times—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I have forgotten where I was, Mr. Chairman. It must be a sign of old age.

What bothers me is I thought we all came here to talk about policy. And so what I said on the floor is that I would like to see once and for all the House put up or shut up on this issue. I would personally prefer there be no earmarks. But as chairman of the committee, I have an obligation to try to find that balance point in the House that reflects the will of the House. I don't have the luxury of pursuing exclusively my own will on a subject. So I have been willing to support bills carrying earmarks even though I don't like what they do to my time and my disposition, to be frank.

So what I said, I want to see an up-or-down on all earmarks. I drafted an amendment to do so and was informed by the Parliamentarian that would be subject to a point of order, and so I chose not to offer an amendment that was an obvious waste of the House's time.

I will say that I am pleased that the gentleman has offered his amendment. Because while it does go as far as mine did, it will give the House an opportunity to decide once and for all, I would hope, whether it favors earmarks or whether it doesn't.

Rather than spending an inordinate amount of the House's time talking about individual earmarks and seeing vote after vote after vote to eliminate them go down to defeat, I think it is about time we find out what the will of the House is. I want to know whether the House wants to proceed with earmarks in these bills or not. I see no problem with their doing so.

But what I will say is if the House does vote for this amendment, then I

will see to it that any bill that comes out from now on has no earmarks. So let's be clear about this. If Members don't want their earmarks, then they should vote for the gentleman's amendment. If they do want their earmarks, if they do think that they have as much right as the President of the United States to determine what happens in their district, then I would suggest that they vote against the amendment. But it is time to put up or shut up. It is time to see where the House stands on this issue.

□ 1345

The committee is trying to reflect the will of the House but we cannot go in both directions at the same time. It's time we find out which direction the House wants to go.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend you for your work and leadership on this bill and especially for recognizing the important work of the Consumer Product Safety Commission and for providing the Commission with funds above the President's request.

Past fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the Republicans means that we've all been working with a tough budget situation this year. But even though we've had to make difficult decisions to get our economy back on the right path, we need also to make room for our most important priorities. I commend you on doing that.

Recent articles in The New York Times and USA Today called our attention to some disturbing trends. The number of recalls made by the CPSC reached a record of 467 last year, and 60 percent of those products were produced in China. This year, every single one of the 24 toys that were recalled for safety reasons by the Consumer Product Safety Commission was manufactured in China. Our children have been playing with toys whose hazards range from laceration, to choking, to severe burns. Several toys we've seen were made with lead paint whose hazards are particularly harmful to children. We also have seen them have the direst of consequences with deaths.

Imports from foreign countries have been growing at a staggering rate, Mr. Chairman, and many manufacturers from these countries fail to adhere to even basic safety standards. It is in this environment, and I know you know this, Mr. Chairman, that the work of the Consumer Product Safety Commission is absolutely critical. Consumer product safety is not an area we can afford to ignore, and the CPSC is not an agency we can afford to underfund.

We can't make up for the shortfalls, unfortunately, in funding that the agency has had overnight, but the funding in this year's Financial Services appropriations bill is a positive step in the right direction. I just want to thank you for your leadership on these issues and I look forward to working with you in the future to ensure that oversight agencies like the CPSC have the funds to do the important work that they are called to do.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for her comments and for raising these important consumer protection issues. I totally agree with her that this Congress must place a new emphasis on consumers and ensuring that defective and dangerous products, particularly from overseas, are kept from the marketplace. I commend the gentlelady for raising these issues. I look forward to working with you.

I may say that if you were to look at our bill and read through the language in the bill, the one thing you will see is a desire by this chairman and the subcommittee to begin anew to look at a whole new way of how consumers should be protected. I think that for too long in this country, we kind of pushed away consumerism as a true issue. We're coming back to that. This bill speaks strongly to that. I commend you for bringing up these issues.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the chairman, and I look forward to working with you to take it in that direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WICKER

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement section 5112(n)(2)(C) of title 31, United States Code.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is a rather straightforward and simple amendment. It would simply restore to the face, or the obverse, of the dollar coin, the new dollar coin that is being minted now, the words "In God We Trust" and "E Pluribus Unum."

"In God We Trust" is the current national motto and has been our motto since 1956. "E Pluribus Unum" was actually suggested by the Congress to be on the seal of the United States of America as early as 1776. These two phrases have been a part of who we are and what we are about for as long as almost anyone within the sound of my voice can remember.

Now, I have in my hand here a United States quarter. On one side, it has "In God We Trust." You turn it over, and this happens to be one of the new quarters featuring a State, it happens to be Rhode Island, but still there's room on the other side of that coin for the term "E Pluribus Unum"—out of many, one people, as I say, a very significant phrase about who we are as a people.

You take the dollar coin, Mr. Speaker, and there's a picture of George Washington on the front, there is a likeness of the Statue of Liberty on the back, but if you're looking for the words "E Pluribus Unum" or "In God We Trust," it's not on either side. In order to find that, you have to look at the very edge of the coin and you have to get the light just right and there it is on the edge of the coin.

I think most people would agree with me, Mr. Chairman, in saying they would like to have these significant phrases returned to a position of prominence on the coin. Whether by design or by accident, whether purposely or unintentionally, the fact that these two important mottos are on the edge of the coin, I think it puts them in a less prominent place, and I think most Americans would appreciate it if we put them back where they should be.

With that, I would urge an "aye" vote on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue his reservation on the point of order?

Mr. SERRANO. No, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman is now recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. It's somewhat a hesitant approach to being against it for the simple reason that we're not sure on this side if his amendment accomplishes anything. The way the amendment is written, some would argue that what the gentleman does is remove In God We Trust from the coin. But it doesn't say that it places it anywhere else. And I know that's not his intent,

that surely would not be my intent, and that would be a terrible talk show topic.

Mr. WICKER. Would the gentleman yield on that point so that can be cleared up?

Mr. SERRANO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. By designating that the part of the dollar coin statute that says it should be edged onto the edge of the coin, by removing that, we revert back to the original statute under which we've been governed all along, which has all of the coins from the half dollar down to the penny with "E Pluribus Unum" and "In God We Trust."

Mr. SERRANO. Reclaiming my time, the way the statute is written, it would not allow that to happen. And in this case, we're actually trying to help you. We're suggesting that what you are doing will in some if not all cases remove In God We Trust and does not make provisions to place it anywhere else. That's our interpretation. That's why I said reluctant opposition because otherwise I would not oppose it.

Secondly, your bill speaks to an item put forth by the mint. Nowhere in this bill does the Mint come up. We don't deal with that. And so that also is an issue. But it's a kind of thing where opposing it will be misunderstood as badly as what you're proposing is totally misunderstood on this side. Your effect may be that you will go down in history as the gentleman who took In God We Trust off the coins and didn't put it on anywhere else.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I'm delighted to yield to my friend from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) a minute and a half.

Mr. GOODE. I want to thank and salute the gentleman from Mississippi for focusing on this issue.

Since the 1800s, In God We Trust has appeared on much of our money. It was even on the two-cent piece that was popular only for a few years in the 1860s.

I've had citizens come up to me and show me the penny, the nickel, the dime, the half dollar and they pull out the new dollar coin and say, "In God We Trust is not in a prominent place." It is on the edge of a coin. And I fully support the effort to take it off the edge and put it on the front.

I would point out having it on the edge or side of the coin has led to numerous mint errors. I have read some accounts that as many as 30,000 dollars do not have the etching on the side of In God We Trust or E Pluribus Unum. And then there have been instances where only the side was punched and that, of course, makes for a highly collectible item. But we need to focus on keeping In God We Trust in a prominent place. I hope it would be the pleasure of this body to support the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi and put In God We Trust back where it belongs.

Mr. WICKER. I would inquire of the Chair as to whether he has any other speakers on this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. No, but I would like to speak myself. I have no other speakers.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. I am informed that the original law was sort of set aside when the law was passed for these particular sets of coins. In other words, these coins speak to In God We Trust on their own in that law, as I understand it. If you now remove that language here, then nothing kicks in from the previous law and you end up with the possibility of no In God We Trust on the coin. Please understand, we're not arguing against putting In God We Trust on the coin. We support it. We're suggesting that your amendment as written may accomplish just the opposite of what you want to accomplish.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for the balance of his time.

Mr. WICKER. My friend the gentleman from New York says there's the possibility that we might do something unintentional here. Really this is quite clear. And Members voting on this in a few moments should understand that it's quite clear. If you feel that "In God We Trust" ought to be put in a place of prominence on the dollar coin, you'll vote "yes" for the amendment. If you feel that the all inclusive phrase "E Pluribus Unum" should be put back on the dollar coin in a place where it can actually be read by people using it in commerce, then you should vote for the Wicker amendment.

If there is a question on interpretation, if there is this possibility that the chairman mentions, certainly that can be cleared up. This amendment has a little farther to go. The Senate may take up the appropriation bills. At some point we will have to come to some sort of agreement between the House and Senate on how to fund the Treasury and the departments dealt with in this appropriation bill.

I say the issue is clear. If you want "In God We Trust" on the dollar coin, it's a very simple question. Vote "aye" on the Wicker amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi will be postponed.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENCE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) add the following:

**TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to implement the Fairness Doctrine, as repealed in *General Fairness Doctrine Obligations of Broadcast Licensees* (50 Fed. Reg. 35418 (1985)), or any other regulations having the same substance.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today, along with my partners in this amendment, Congressman JEB HENSARLING of Texas, Congressman JEFF FLAKE of Arizona, very much in a spirit of bipartisanship. We come to the floor in this moment, on this amendment, to be about that, which I think we are all about.

The freedom of speech and the freedom of the press is not a partisan issue in this Congress. We all live under and cherish that first amendment that says Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

I, myself, Mr. Chairman, have worked in a bipartisan way in this Congress to fashion legislation that ensures a free and independent press. The amendment before this body today is simply an extension of that mission.

Our legislation would simply say that none of the funds made available in this act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to implement the Fairness Doctrine, as repealed in 1985.

Now, the Fairness Doctrine actually came to pass in 1949, part of a regulation of a much older law. It required broadcasters to prevent controversial issues in a fair and balanced manner. That sounds reasonable enough. But because of the lack of clarity in the regulation, in the commission's rulings, broadcasters, during almost four decades, often opted not to offer any controversial programming whatsoever.

The FCC concluded that, in fact, by 1985, this regulation was having a chilling effect on the public debate and repealed it effective 1987. Since the demise of the Fairness Doctrine, talk radio particularly has emerged as a dynamic forum for public debate and, I offer, an asset to the Nation.

Our amendment, simply put, is an effort to maintain the status quo, to prevent this administration and this Fed-

eral Communications Commission, in this fiscal year about which we are debating, to use no funds to return the Fairness Doctrine.

Now, I want to acknowledge the fact that there are some who are skeptical about the need for this amendment. I have heard distinguished and respected Members of this body come to this floor and say that this is, quote, an issue which does not exist, and have seen writing, and I expect we will hear rhetoric to that effect, and I will respect the words of each person that utters that view, but I will differ.

Just for example, in the last 2 days, the Senate majority whip, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, RICHARD DURBIN, said, "It's time to reinstitute the Fairness Doctrine." That was yesterday. In the last several days, the chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, said she was looking at reviving the Fairness Doctrine. The Democrat nominee for the President of the United States in 2004, the distinguished Senator JOHN KERRY, said, "I think the Fairness Doctrine ought to be there," and he went on to say, "I also think the equal time doctrine ought to come back." Most recently, the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank, published an entire report on what it called the "structural imbalance of political talk radio."

So you will forgive me if many of us sense there is afoot in the Nation's Capital a bit of a cool breeze on the freedom of the press and the freedom of expression on the airwaves. So we seize this opportunity in the appropriations process, with my partners, JEFF FLAKE and JEB HENSARLING, and hopefully a bipartisan majority in this Congress, to say yes to freedom and to reject, in this fiscal year, the power that we have in the spending bill, any funds to be spent to bring back this unfairness doctrine to American broadcasting law.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to inform the gentleman that we will accept his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Who claims time in opposition?

Mr. OBEY. For purposes of debate, I would like to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is much ado about nothing. We have been subjected to filibuster by amendment all week, and now we are going to be subjected to 40 minutes of so-called debate on a nonexistent issue. Now, why is this issue here?

There isn't anybody in the Congress that I know of who is trying to legislatively resurrect the Fairness Doctrine, and, certainly, the totally Republican-dominated commission is not going to resurrect that doctrine.

What's at stake here is that a certain Senator, who evidently was afflicted by a bad case of being hit by sun spots so he no longer believes that there is anything like global warming, claims that he was in an elevator and overheard a couple of Senators talk about resurrecting the fairness clause. The two Senators involved say that's nonsense.

But what you have got going on here is an effort on the part of right-wing radio to gin up the folks by inventing a fight that doesn't exist. As far as I'm concerned, it's immaterial to me how people vote on this. If Members want the debate to go until 8:00 tonight instead of 7:00, fine, spend 40 minutes debating an issue that doesn't exist.

But what I do find interesting is that folks who scream every day of the week about that so-called "liberal press," all of a sudden they are now saying, "Oh, my God, can you imagine, somebody might force a fairness doctrine on us." Well, one would think that if they really do believe the press is liberal, that they would then want the protection that would come from the Fairness Doctrine.

I think the very fact that they don't want to see the Fairness Doctrine resurrected is, in fact, an open admission that they recognize the radio waves are largely and almost totally dominated by the right and the far right and the off-the-wall right.

I don't see any purpose in taking any more time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, first let me acknowledge my gratitude that the chairman of this subcommittee will accept this amendment and has endorsed it on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my partner in this amendment, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned that he heard one Senator with sun spots overheard two other Senators talking.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. Yes, I would.

Mr. OBEY. I didn't say he was from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. No, he wasn't from Arizona. The gentleman can be excused. He has been very busy, and I am glad he has been reading earmark request letters. There have been a lot of them, so he has been tied up.

But what he missed, as the good gentleman from Indiana mentioned, Senate Majority Whip DICK DURBIN from Illinois, not afflicted with sun spots, by the way, just yesterday said, "It is time to reinstitute the Fairness Doctrine." So I don't think that we are seeing things here. There is a move afoot.

Make no mistake, this is targeted at talk radios, where conservatives seem to have done a little better in the marketplace than the other side of the argument.

So forgive us for being skeptical that nothing is afoot. But when the majority leader in the Senate says it's time to reinstitute the Fairness Doctrine, I think we're right to be concerned.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. I agree with my colleague from Wisconsin that this debate is a red herring, that it is an effort to perpetuate the abuse of the public trust by holing up the usual straw man to divert attention from the fact that our airwaves are being abused and our democracy is being eroded. It's an effort to fire up a base.

An informed electorate is essential to a strong democracy. One of the things that I would like to say to my colleagues, there is a conflation here where they are talking about freedom of the press. In the Constitution, freedom of the press relates to freedom that newspapers have.

The electronic media is governed by the FCC, and the 1934 act says that electronic media has to serve in the public interest, convenience and necessity. Just for the sake of keeping the record straight, you can talk about the freedom of the press and you may mean newspapers, radio and TV.

But it is a fact that the electronic media is governed by the FCC. Under the laws of the FCC, 1934, we are supposed to be operating a public interest, convenience and necessity.

Now, the proponents of this amendment and of right-wing corporate radio and TV are saying that they are threatened by this fairness doctrine because they think, incorrectly, it will require corporate radio and TV to be actually fair and balanced. I think they are probably threatened by such a prospect because they know that this particular type of radio and TV communication is not.

Now, any proposal to address the real issue here, restoring genuinely productive public debate, would need to restore accountability to those who use the publicly owned airwaves. The first step would be to reverse the extreme concentration of media ownership. Let's have this debate out in the open, not when some are trying to use a red herring to try to prevent reinstatement of a rule that this administration would never reinstate, never, not a way.

As Mr. OBEY said, what's this debate about? It's a debate about something that's not going to happen under this administration, but it may happen under a future administration.

Mr. PENCE. I think the gentleman from Ohio knows how much I respect his liberal passion and often feel it mirrors my conservative passion, but let me emphasize and agree with his final point.

It is precisely about the next administration that many here in this Chamber and many here in America are concerned with leaving in the Federal Communications Commission the resources or the authority to reregulate the public airwaves.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my partner in this amendment, the distinguished chairman of the Republican Study Committee, JEB HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, there is no greater guarantor of our democracy and our freedoms than the first amendment. There is no greater threat to our first amendment, freedom of speech, than the resurrection of the so-called Fairness Doctrine. The use of the term "fairness doctrine" would make George Orwell blush. The use of the program would make Hugo Chavez jealous.

Fairness, fairness particularly, as defined and policed by government, is the absolute antithesis of freedom.

It is patently unfair, and there was a time in our Nation's history when liberals proudly spoke out and jealously guarded our first amendment rights, and now, as we have heard from others, they seek to shut it down.

If, in doubt, colleagues err on the side of freedom.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I find this very odd, this situation we are in.

We heard a number of our Republican colleagues come to the floor today to object to particular spending items in the bill, but this might be a first. Mr. PENCE has an amendment here to prevent spending on something that doesn't exist.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's worth us having a real debate on the need for a fairness doctrine. But before we get into the merits of the Fairness Doctrine, we should point out that the Fairness Doctrine has not existed since 1987, so that the argument that the Fairness Doctrine has somehow caused bias in America media is a complete red herring.

But I think we need to take a hard look at what happens to our public dialogue in this country when only six companies have dominion over public debate.

□ 1415

Mr. PENCE says he doesn't want the Federal Government deciding what is fair and what is not fair, but at least the Federal Government is accountable to voters. And so I think we need to get back to what is really fair in an open society. And I urge my colleagues to vote against the Pence amendment.

And I would urge Mr. PENCE to join us in working to open up a free, true market in American media. And I stand ready to work with you, Mr. PENCE, or any other Member of this House who wants to shift our public debate away from the centrally planned media environment we have today to a truly, functional, free market where new entrepreneurs have a chance to compete with established media companies and where new ideas have a chance to compete with the old and failed policies of the past.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Republican whip of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I'm on the side that this debate does matter. And, in fact, I think I just heard debate begin, as our good friend just suggested that this doctrine does need to be looked at and does need to be changed.

I certainly think that this debate is more meaningful than whether the Vice President is part of the executive branch of government or not, and I'm grateful to Mr. PENCE and Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. FLAKE for bringing this issue to the floor today.

I'm also grateful, and appreciate the majority's willingness to accept this. And while this may not be an item that was on the House agenda last week, I think it's clearly an item on the agenda of debate in the country.

The fairness doctrine, or the so-called fairness doctrine is a clear and bald-faced attack on free speech. It's been declared such by the Supreme Court and the FCC, and just about every reasonable American who ever heard about it.

Proponents of the doctrine don't like what they hear on the radio, but instead of empowering the process by engaging the points with regular Americans, they prefer to empower a government agency to silence those voices.

This is a diverse country with rich and robust views on politics, on culture, on society, on the role of government. The right to vocalize disagreements on all those topics in whatever medium or whatever way is available, is fundamentally what differentiates us from the countries, the totalitarian views of regimes that our country has stood against for now 230 years.

But the fairness doctrine would limit those rights and submit private broadcasters to arbitrary rules of so-called fairness, rules, I suppose, that would change from year to year, depending on who controlled the Congress or who controlled the White House.

The content of radio and television shows should be directed by station managers, not by government bureaucrats. The success or failure of that programming should be determined by the marketplace of options and the marketplace of ideas, not by some arbitrary rule of a government agency.

Again, I want to thank Mr. PENCE, Mr. FLAKE and Mr. HENSARLING for offering this important amendment. I urge its support, both in the House today and in the debates that I believe are starting now.

It may have been in an elevator yesterday and a hearing room tomorrow and the FCC in the future, if we don't engage in this important debate again.

I'm grateful to the majority for accepting this amendment, but I urge all Members of the House to speak out loudly against this so-called doctrine as this debate continues.

Mr. SERRANO. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. First of all, if this is not a political stunt for the public and for those talk shows to carry in support, then why are we debating for 40 minutes an amendment that I accepted at the beginning and almost interrupted the gentleman in accepting it?

Another thing that's very interesting, if you don't believe that you have great support in the electronic media right now, if you don't believe that those stations have gone out of their way to give the conservative point of view and leave out those of us who may be considered liberals and who consider themselves liberals, then why are you so afraid of something called the fairness doctrine? If there's nothing to get fixed because there's nothing broken, what's the concern?

Well, obviously, you must know that there's something that you may stand to lose, otherwise you wouldn't make a big fuss about it.

Now, let me tell you something. Probably any so-called liberal you would get on radio, if one was hired by any of those stations, would probably be a moderate. You have nothing to worry about. Mr. KUCINICH and I are not leaving Congress. We will not have a radio or TV show any time soon, and therefore, it won't be what you think it is. It'll be pretty moderate.

But, again, what is the problem with going against an issue where you claim that there's a problem and, in fact, we know no issue exists. Now, that seems to be a prevailing behavior here today. You have seen amendments and you will see more coming later that speak to something that's not an issue. It's not a problem. And this one, I'm actually accepting it. I'm saying let Rush and the other guys, you know, continue to be fair and balanced in their approach. That's fine with me. And here you want more and more and more of the same.

But, again, not to be flippant in any way, I assure you that neither in Spanish or in English have I been offered a radio show that would make your skin crawl moving it to the left where the debate should be at times. Have no fear, I'm staying in Congress for as long as I can be in Congress, and you have nothing to fear but your fears itself.

I yield back.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, and to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I appreciate both the tone and the good natured aspects of his remarks. But I say very seriously when he asked the question rhetorically, he says you act as though there's something you would stand to lose.

Our view is, despite the gentleman's assurances that I completely accept as sincere, what we stand to lose is free-

dom. We have some of the most prominent and powerful Members of this Congress stepping forward and calling for the regulation of free speech on the air waves of America using this archaic doctrine dubbed as the fairness doctrine.

And today, with the support of the majority, we will send a deafening message that not on our watch will that occur.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a former broadcaster, distinguished member of the Commerce Committee, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I am still a broadcaster, actually. My family has been in radio broadcasting for more than 20 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman suspend? The microphone is not on.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it seems rather cruel that a radio broadcaster would not have his microphone turned on. And so I stand here today in support of this amendment because it really is about the first amendment. And it is about the freedom of speech on the air waves. And if you don't think so, go back to what the U.S. Supreme Court said in *Red Lion Broadcasting vs. FCC* 38 years ago when they cautioned that while the doctrine may be constitutional, if it's ever used to restrain speech its constitutionality should be reconsidered.

1974, in *Miami Herald Publishing Company vs. Torino*, the Court concluded that the doctrine inescapably dampens the vigor and limits the variety of public debate.

Twenty-three years ago, in *FCC vs. League of Women Voters*, the court concluded the scarcity rationale underlying the doctrine was flawed, and the doctrine was limiting the breadth of public debate. The U.S. Supreme Court made that series of rulings and, as a result, the FCC overturned it. And as a result of overturning that, all of a sudden, the air waves blossomed with both conservative speech and liberal speech.

It's not my fault that Air America didn't find a huge audience out there and went bankrupt. There are others out there who have done very successfully. It has encouraged speech.

If the fairness doctrine is put back in place, as it was pre-1987, you will silence, not expand, public debate. I've been a broadcaster. I know what it was like when it was in place, and I know what it will be like again. And while I don't always agree with those who are on the air waves, I will always defend their right to speak their piece because it actually energizes people to get involved.

So yes, I have a talk radio station and yes, it does have Rush Limbaugh on it, and it does have Sean Hannity on it and Michael Reagan and others. And this is what American broadcasting is about, in part.

But what we're really about here is protecting the fundamental constitutional rights of first amendment speech that we stood on this floor and raised



our hand to protect and uphold, and the courts have made it clear that re-instituting the fairness doctrine, if used to restrict speech, would be unconstitutional.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Republican leader of the United States House of Representatives, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from Indiana for yielding, and thank he and his colleagues who have introduced this amendment for their work.

All of this talk about bringing back the fairness doctrine caused me to think about the whole idea of the Federal Communications Commission, set up in the 1930s to regulate the air waves and the spectrum that's out there so that we didn't have two radio stations on the same wave. This was set up in the 1930s.

And then in the 1940s we got into the idea that, well, there aren't that many options in TV and radio, and so maybe we ought to make sure that all of them, in terms of what they say, is fair.

Well, that might have been helpful in the 1940s and 1950s and 1960s, but my goodness, we're in the 21st century, where people get their news from thousands of different sources. It could be radio, from hundreds and hundreds of radio stations. It could be from TV, where we now have hundreds and hundreds of stations. It could be from the Internet. It could be from the newspapers. There's lots of places for people to get their news.

And at the end of the day, as I think about the fairness doctrine, I think about those of us in Congress. We get elected based on our constituents and what we're for and what we're against, whether they like us or they don't like us. And if they like us, they might vote for us again. And if they don't like us, guess what, they get to go punch the ballot for somebody else.

Well, when it comes to the issue of the fairness doctrine, when we're dealing with radio, they can go a lot of different places. And I think that the best way is to let the judgment of the American people decide. And they can decide with their finger. They can turn it off or they can turn it on. They can change channels or they can decide to go to their computer and read it on the Internet.

And the idea that people are calling for the fairness doctrine to be called back reminds me, once again, of why I came here. I came here because I thought government was too big, it spent too much, and no one was holding the government accountable.

Let's trust the American people to do what they think is best. Their finger can make all the decisions, all that they need to make on their own behalf. Let's trust them to do the right thing.

Mr. PENCE. With gratitude to the Republican leader for his eloquent re-

marks, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. I too want to thank Congressman FLAKE and the cosponsors of this amendment. Our friends on the Democratic side have two arguments. Number 1, they say this is a superfluous, it's a red herring because nobody's talking about it. But we've already had two of our colleagues on the Democratic side say that they like talking about and maybe rehabilitating the fairness doctrine, which is a bad misnomer. In fact, this is the leftist censorship doctrine, and we ought to refer to it as such.

The second argument that they give us is that Republicans ought to like the fairness doctrine because we're always complaining about liberal bias in the media. And to that I would say this: The difference is that Rush Limbaugh knows and admits he's a conservative.

□ 1430

Dan Rather and Katie Couric don't know and they don't admit that they are liberal. That is the difference. Rush will get regulated; the others will not. And I would tell you that the first amendment, freedom of speech, means nothing if it means the government can tell you what you must say or what you must publish. The freedom of speech inherently means the freedom not to say certain thoughts or certain words.

Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart, no conservative, once said: "Censorship reflects society's lack of confidence in itself. It is a hallmark of an authoritarian regime."

In China, North Korea, and elsewhere, they have their "fairness doctrines." We don't need one.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a member of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. PENCE for bringing this amendment and I support it. I do not think that we should spend taxpayer dollars to resurrect the 1929 doctrine, which was imposed by the old Federal Radio Commission.

Several Senators now say they don't like free speech on radio and TV, and they are looking to exhume the body of a 1920s-era radio regulation because they do not want Americans to hear. This 1920s radio regulation, appropriately called a "doctrine," was put into law by President Herbert Hoover. Remember, during that time, Western powers also signed a Kellogg pact that outlawed war, Alaska and Hawaii were not States, Mickey Mouse got his first cartoon, and Joseph Stalin became the unquestioned ruler of the Soviet Union.

This 1929 radio regulation that these Senators want to dig up was written when there was no TV, no cable, no Internet, not to mention no satellite or MySpace or YouTube. As kids today

would say, this doctrine is so 20th century, and it should not be part of our 21st century.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished and eloquent gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chairman, in just several days, America will be celebrating her birthday. As we enjoy the 4th of July, we recall the brave patriots who stood up to the biggest military power in the world and defended basic principles that they were willing to lay their lives down for. Their wives and their children suffered as well.

As they had a chance to develop a systematic form of government and to lay out the very most important things that they had suffered so hard for. The very first amendment to the Constitution was about free speech. The Founders believed that it was critical to protect property, and of all forms of property. The thing that issues from a man's heart is the most precious. For a person to be able to have a belief and to be able to speak that freely is a precious thing not only to our Founders but to all who have been defenders of the first amendment.

I thank our colleagues who have issued this fantastic amendment. I think we should support it with the last drop of our blood and the last farthing of our treasure.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a force of nature on the House floor, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. TOM PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time and I appreciate his leadership on this.

Mr. Chairman, freedom is the foundational principle of our society. Our Founders were champions of this God-given right and charged future generations with eternal vigilance to protect it.

We are here today because some very prominent Democrat leaders, including the Senate whip, want Uncle Sam to start telling radio and TV personalities what to talk about, to limit their freedom and ours. Rather than fight in the marketplace of ideas, they want to bring back a 1929 radio regulation known as the Fairness Doctrine, which has nothing to do with fairness.

A so-called "fairness doctrine" today tramples upon freedom of speech and freedom of the press. It dictates to Americans that in an open and free and flooded marketplace of ideas, they need Washington politicians to sort it all out.

Mr. Chairman, real freedom means a government that listens to the people, not one that dictates to the people whom they must listen to.

Let's keep the Fairness Doctrine off our airwaves and in the history books where it belongs.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).



Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support this amendment by the gentlemen from Indiana and from Texas.

Fair and balanced media, truly a laudable goal. But, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, we achieve that result when we do, in fact, let the public decide. They report; you do decide. That is more than just a catch phrase. That is what this American public is about.

You see, it is the market, and when I say the "market," I mean the American people, for they are the best arbiters of what a free press is and to obtain it and they are the best mechanism to achieve it in this Nation. It is not the unelected bureaucrats of a central government that we must look to. We must look to the American public.

So I rise to strongly support this amendment, this amendment that will guarantee us a free press.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from Ohio for yielding and my friend from Indiana for offering this amendment.

Let me say this: there seems to be some doubt over there or something from the subcommittee Chair and the full committee Chair about why we don't believe them. Well, in November they kind of snookered the public. They had told them that they were going to give more affordable health care to all Americans, which hasn't been done. They were bring gas prices down, which, hello, if you are out there at the pump, you know that's not true. And then we were going to get away from dependence on foreign oil, which last night we saw that we voted not to do that, but to be dependent on them.

So you fooled the public in November; so we don't want you to fool us this time. And I think it is evident that you are trying to trick us when you had two Members go down and talk about the only reason why you are not going back against the Fairness Doctrine is because you don't have the FCC.

And let me say you have said that the Republicans are calling this a red herring. Well, I want to say the majority party is looking at the Fairness Doctrine as the one that got away. The one that got away. You all want to recapture that one that got away.

So I hope that all of my colleagues will vote in support of this. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for offering it with Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. FLAKE.

And I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

And I want to take this time to say how much I support the Pence-Flake-

Hensarling amendment in regard to this so-called "fairness" issue. It would be patently unfair, this so-called doctrine.

Wouldn't it be nice if we could say the same thing to the editorial boards of the Los Angeles Times and the Atlanta Journal Constitution? Wouldn't it be nice if we could say the same thing to Hollywood in regard to all these movies that our young people are being exposed to? Wouldn't it be nice if we could say the same thing to our public universities and colleges in regard to the teachers of political science and the guest lecturers and those who give the baccalaureate addresses? But freedom of speech doesn't allow that.

I clearly endorse this amendment. The FCC should not spend one dime promoting this so-called "fairness doctrine," which is anything but fair.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I appreciate that very much.

The Fairness Doctrine is such a misnomer. It may be an oxymoron, if you would. But one of the great things about this country throughout our history since we became a country has been that rather than have another revolution, people can express their views. They can say what they want. The Fairness Doctrine suppressed that a great deal and it fomented a lot of agitation.

As long as people can get out there and express their views, we're going to be okay. We can disagree. We can fix things. We can complain about things. But when you run in and start saying you're talking too much about this issue, you're saying too much on this side, then we are looking for another revolution. I do not want to see that.

We don't need the Fairness Doctrine, this misnomer. It is time to set it aside for good and move forward with free speech.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding and for his support of this amendment. And I also wish to thank the gentleman from New York for accepting this amendment.

I believe what we will do in this legislation will demonstrate a bipartisan commitment to freedom on the airwaves at a time that intemperate remarks are being made by others in Washington, D.C., both within the Capitol Building and within the punditocracy that surrounds this Capitol Building.

This Congress in bipartisan numbers, and I trust the numbers will be large, will say "yes" to freedom on the airwaves, "yes" to the freedom of expression, and "yes" to the freedom of the press.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the "unfairness doc-

trine" and vote "aye" on the Pence amendment on behalf of my colleagues JEFF FLAKE and JEB HENSARLING.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as someone of note said a long time ago, it will be little noted nor long remembered what we say here today. Certainly this has not been one of the most scintillating debates in the history of the Republic.

But I do want to thank my friends on the right because if our folks on talk radio and yap yap TV, if they actually believed that there was a fiercely liberal press that dominated the country, then they would be running kicking and screaming, demanding a Fairness Doctrine. And the fact that the folks on talk radio and yap yap TV are doing just the opposite indicates to me that they are publicly admitting that they are not "fair and balanced."

A lot of fun has been made of the FCC. It started in 1929, Herbert Hoover. Herbert Hoover was a very unlucky President who happened to be a very fine man and who had, I think, for his long illustrious life, a pretty good understanding of what it takes to be basically fair in this country. You ought to go back and read some of Herbert Hoover's speeches. He takes a lot of guff, but he was a very impressive man, with a misguided economic policy, but he was a very impressive human being.

When the FCC was created, it was based on the idea that the airwaves, which were being licensed to private holders, were, in fact, property of the public and that it is sort of like our stewardship of the Earth. My religious beliefs tell me that we never really own property even if we have title to it. We lease it from God for a while and we have stewardship responsibility.

□ 1445

Now that, in my view, is the same view that the government had when they started licensing radio stations. What they said to people who stood to make a lot of money with those licenses is, "Look, if you're going to use the public airwaves, make sure that all sides get a fair shake of the argument. That's what it was all about. It has long since gone by the boards because of court decisions and other administrative actions by various administrations.

Right wing radio today looks at those airwaves as being their open private preserve, and they're not going to give them up at all. But don't worry, I would not, for a second, want to see Rush Limbaugh or good old Sean moderated. I want to see the real, raw Rush. I want him and folks like him to be thoroughly and fully exposed to the American listening audience in all of their bloviating glory. I want to let Rush be Rush. And that isn't going to bother me if he goes on for hours and hours with his one-sided diatribes. Everybody knows he's plugged directly into Republican national headquarters. And so in my view, he is virtually discredited, and I would like to keep it that way.

So all I guess I would say, Mr. Chairman, is that I think we ought to let right wing radio go on just as they do now. Rush and Sean are just about as important in the scheme of things as Paris Hilton. And I would hate to see them gain an ounce of credibility by being forced by a government agency or anybody else to moderate their views enough so that they just might become modestly influential or respectable.

With that, Mr. Chairman, could I inquire of how much time is remaining on the other side?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman from Indiana has 1 minute.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and let the gentleman use his minute, and then I will close.

Mr. PENCE. There is no question that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is a tough act to follow, but I appreciate his decorum, his demeanor and always his candor on this floor.

But let me reassure him and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the bipartisan vote that I expect will be recorded today will be an encouragement to people on the right, to people on the left, and people in the center, people in front of microphones and people listening to those people on microphones because this House will say what some in the other body are not saying, and that is, we believe in freedom on the airwaves. We reject the archaic doctrines of the past that would have this Federal Government manage political speech on the public airwaves.

It is time that we come together as a Nation, we move past the archaic rules of broadcasting fashioned for a Depression-era America, and we embrace the dynamic national conversation that is the American media today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. May I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 8 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. I won't take the time, let me just simply sum up very briefly.

As the Chair knows, we've gone through the last 30 minutes debating a nonissue. The amendment has already been accepted by the committee. And I would expect that there will be an overwhelmingly vote for it because there is no prospect of any serious effort to revive the Fairness Doctrine, either legislatively or legally. And so, this has really been another political exercise.

I've almost given up expecting that substance will dominate legislative debate. We had a State senator by the name of Lynn Stalbaum, who served in Wisconsin many years ago. And the legislature was covered by a man by the name Aldric Revell. Aldric was an acerbic reporter who had the temperament of H.L. Menkin and a pen to

match. And he wrote this about Stalbaum one day, he said, "Stalbaum is a superb legislator, but he has the maddening tendency to expect reason to dominate legislative debate."

I don't really expect, on issues like this, to have much common sense in the House. You get six like-minded people in this institution, they talk to each other in the cloakroom and they think they've conducted a public opinion poll.

So all I would say is, I fundamentally disagree with the gentleman who indicated that this is a highly important vote. I think, as another famous author once said, this is a lot of sound and fury signifying nothing.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana concerning the fairness doctrine.

I am opposed to this amendment. The amendment concerns an important communications policy issue that is properly addressed in the authorizing committee. This is a classic example, of which I have seen many, of an attempt to legislate on a spending bill.

The fairness doctrine is an important, complex issue. It concerns many of the core policy values that Congress assigns to local broadcasters. It concerns the First Amendment, and localism in the media. It is, in short, an issue that should first be considered by the authorizing committee. For that reason alone, I oppose the amendment.

Even if the amendment were not procedurally defective, the amendment is entirely unnecessary. I understand from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) chairman's office that the FCC has no plans to even debate the issue, much less take action. In other words, there will be no action at the FCC on the fairness doctrine.

It is therefore unclear why the gentleman—who must know this fact—is even offering the amendment. I hope my colleagues consider that question as they vote on the amendment. I will vote against it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 31 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

At the end of bill (before the short title), insert the following:

# TITLE IX

## ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act (including titles IV and VIII) that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 8.9 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the Chair.

And let me, as I did yesterday when I offered a similar amendment to the appropriations bill we dealt with then, let me start by thanking the chairman and the ranking member and the committee for their work. I have the utmost respect particularly for the ranking member. I have respect for the chairman as well, but particularly the ranking member, who comes from the great Buckeye State. I appreciate his service over the years to Ohio, not just in northern Ohio, but to our entire State.

I bring before the body again an amendment. This is the fifth time. And as I said yesterday, I don't do this to be a pain in the neck, I do it because I think government spends too much money.

In this particular bill, the increase over fiscal year 2007 spending levels to what's in front of us today and dominating our debate is a \$2 billion increase. And so my amendment would simply say, let's not increase the budget by \$2 billion in this appropriations bill. Let's simply do what all kinds of families are doing across this country, let's spend last year's level. Let's live within last year's budget as all kinds of taxpayers, all kinds of families, all kinds of business owners are having to do across this country. It's not too much to ask government to do the same.

Here is why it's important. It's important because there is a growing financial crisis coming for this country, which is the entitlement programs, which we're not even talking about today. Whether it's entitlement programs or discretionary spending, which we are focused on today, we've got to get a handle on spending. There is no better place to start than today and say, you know what, let's live with what we lived on last year.

The other reason it's critical that we do this, and this is just as sure as the sun is going to come up tomorrow, whenever you spend and spend and spend, it inevitably leads to tax and tax and tax. I've said every single time I've presented this amendment, and it's every bit as true today, that it's not tax and spend, it's spend and tax. Spending drives the equation. If we can hold the line on spending, we can keep taxes low on American families, on American taxpayers and on American

business owners. That's why this amendment is so important.

Let me just point to a couple of specific things. The bill in front of us today increases spending 9 percent over last year's budget. Now again, there are some great things in this bill. And as I said earlier, I commend the chairman and the ranking member for the work they've done and the committee's work as well, but I want to point out some of the things that taxpayer dollars are going to be spent on.

First, the text of the bill weakens an existing provision in current law that prohibits funds from being used for any needle exchange program in the District of Columbia. Taxpayers might want to know that their dollars are going to be spent for something like that. The text of the bill weakens the existing provision in current law that prohibits Federal funds from being used for the District of Columbia Domestic Partner law, something taxpayers I know in the Fourth District in Ohio, but probably all across this country, would like to know.

And then the third one, and I will just point out, the IRS, that wonderful agency that so many Americans and so many taxpayers love, is going to get a \$550 million increase over last year's budget, 5 percent over last year's budget. I said yesterday on the floor, in the course of our debate, that when you get all this additional government, all this new government, all this new spending, it reminds me of a statement from one of our great presidents, our third President, Mr. Jefferson. Mr. Jefferson said, "When government fears the people, there is a liberty. When people fear the government, there is tyranny."

Now, with that statement in mind, just ask yourself the simple question: American taxpayers can ask themselves a simple question; if next week when we're home someone knocks at our door and we answer the door and they identify themselves as, hello, I'm Mr. Smith and I'm from the IRS, is your first response, oh, joy, one of my government servants is here to help me today? I mean, that's what American taxpayers are in store for. That very agency that they have not the fondest respect for is going to get a 5 percent increase in this bill.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's too much to ask for government to live on last year's budget. That's what this amendment does.

I appreciate, again, the work that the committee has done, but I think it's certainly within reason to say we can keep spending where it was last year again, like all kinds of families are having to do across this country.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was beginning to feel left out. We were moving along with this bill, and I

had not seen the usual cast of very intelligent and proper folks come to the floor to attack the bill and to try to cut it. And I have to tell you, I'm a very sensitive guy, I was beginning to feel left out. But now I realize you care. Except that you care to an extreme. You want to cut this bill by 8.9 percent. And I noticed that you didn't say what you usually say, which is, that this is a small cut because you know that this is a devastating cut.

It is part of a mantra that's been taking place every day, where a group of you come and say that these bills are way over budget and they have to be cut. Now, I've been on the Appropriations Committee many years now. And during the 12, 14 years that the Republican Party was in control, just about every single year that I can remember every appropriations bill went up by a certain amount. And it was easy to see Republicans would have President Bush come in with a certain amount, and they would add more to it. And that's before it got to the Republican Senate. I'm not allowed to talk about the Senate, but you know what happens over there. But now, all of a sudden, these bills are way over budget, and you folks are so concerned.

Still, not a single one of you will vote for the real budget breaker, or against it, which is the war in Iraq. Yes, we have a deficit. But you know the truth, whether you like to admit it or not, when President Clinton left office, we had a surplus. That's not my comment, that's a fact. We had a surplus. We squandered that surplus. How? By going into a war built on lies and bad information, and now we're caught up to here in that war in many ways. The tragedy of lost life. But we're paying half a trillion dollars for it. No one on that side gets up to say that budget has to be cut. The budget that has to be cut is for the employees at the Treasury Department. It's for the FCC. It's for the Small Business Administration. It's for the agencies that help people in this country.

Now, interestingly enough, I thought that you were going to spare me, and I don't want to contradict myself that I felt left out, but that you were going to spare me because we came in below the President's request. Let's make that clear. Your President, my President, but your party's President, came in at \$243 million above what we have in this bill. In other words, had I done exactly what President Bush wanted, this bill would be \$243 million more. I came in at \$243 million below, and you still want to cut it.

But you're not cutting it half a percent as some will do, or 1 percent, which is bad enough, but 8.9 percent. So what is this? Most of the funding in this bill, more than 80 percent, is for the administrative operations of about 25 Federal agencies. A cut of this magnitude called for in this amendment would devastate the Treasury Department, the judicial branch, and the Small Business Administration. Yes,

the judicial branch. Our courts would be hurt.

□ 1500

We are in a war against terror. Part of what the Treasury Department does is to follow the money to see where terrorists could be moving money around in this country and overseas, money that could hurt us.

You are trying to cut this by 8.9 percent. Then what you will do is you will say, well, this is one cut. But then if you add all the amendments on cuts today, it will be close to 15 percent if we were to approve all of them. Just like if you add all the cuts on all the bills, we would just have to close up the government and go home. That may be a good idea for some of you. But right now, the Yankees are not winning as much as I want them to, so I may not want to go home for a while.

But understand something. I may at times make light of some of this. It is not a desire to say that this is not important. It is a full understanding that what you are doing is just to score political points. Because you can't, on one hand, vote to continue to approve half a trillion for the war in Iraq and at the same time say that you want to cut money from the Treasury Department, the Small Business Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

On the other hand, you can't continue to support tax cuts that went to the richest people in the country and at the same time say that you want to cut this. It doesn't make any sense. Just the same way that you support tax cuts for the rich, but resisted until we had to drag you, kicking and screaming, to approve a minimum wage increase of a couple of bucks for people who haven't had one in 40 years.

So let's be honest. Let's be honest. You want to be serious? Let's be serious. Come to the floor and present some things that are serious in nature. You are devastating this bill. We are not going to stand for it. That is why we urge everyone to reject this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the distinguished ranking member, just let me say a couple of things in response to the chairman. We certainly care about the Chair, but, Mr. Chairman, we care about the American taxpayers as well.

Tax cuts go to taxpayers, not the rich. Tax cuts go to taxpayers. But we have had to debate this every single time we have brought these series of amendments forward when you talk about cutting the bills, drastic cuts, the-sky-is-going-to-fall cuts. All we are saying is, let's spend what we spent last year.

Now, only in Washington when you spend the same amount of money that you spent last year is that called a cut. Only in Washington. Back in Ohio, back in Urbana, back in Lima, back in Findlay, no one would call that a cut. They would say, you know what? The government is getting by on what they did last year. That is probably something they should do, when they're talking about a \$3 trillion budget that they spend each year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and the next couple of amendments. Just as the gentleman said, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio a quick question: Does this amendment propose that this bill spend less money this year than it spent last year?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. No, not at all, Mr. RYAN. The amendment would spend exactly what we spent last year.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we hear this word "cut" all the time. Cut. Cut. Cut. Only here in Congress, only here in Washington is spending the same amount of money this year as we spent last year a deep horrible, awful, disastrous cut. We are proposing to spend almost 10 percent more next year.

How many family budgets went up by this much money, an 8.9 percent increase? How much did wages go up this year? How much did pay raises go up? Did they go up 8.9 percent for most families this year from last year? No. So why should we be giving government such a huge pay raise?

What we are doing by doing this is we are taking more money away from the paychecks of working men and women to give government a bigger paycheck, to give government a bigger pay raise.

Mr. Chairman, what this is about is about trying to bring discipline to the way we spend taxpayer dollars. The budget we are operating under today contains within it the largest tax increase in American history. The budget we are operating on today says that all those tax cuts that expire at the end of the decade, we want them to expire. And do you know what? We are going to start spending that money now.

So the reason this amendment is important, and other amendments like this are important, is we are trying to reduce the spending appetite of government, of Washington, so we can make sure that we don't raise those taxes. Because if the incumbent budget resolution actually fulfills its promise, this money will get spent and those taxes will get raised. That is what this is about.

It is different approaches, different philosophies. We don't believe in all these huge increases: triple the rate of inflation, triple the rate of our con-

stituents' ability to pay their taxes. We believe government should live within its means.

Let me be the first to say that both parties have done a lousy job of keeping track of this over the years. Both parties have some of the blame to share. But in the last couple of years, this party, which is now in the minority, did do a better job of holding the line on domestic spending. This party did take on entitlements. This party did stand against tax increases.

So, Mr. Chairman, you see here an emerging difference between whether or not we ought to have the largest tax increase in history and whether or not we ought to be increasing spending, and not at the rate of inflation, not at twice the rate of inflation, but at three times the rate of inflation.

I am pleased that this committee allocation is under the President's request. I wish all the subcommittee allocations were underneath the President's request, including the Defense.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. There will be more speakers on this side, but the gentleman has a wonderful cast over there. I am sure they could go for a while before we go over here.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think of ourselves as a "cast." I think of ourselves as the people that we were sent here to be, representatives of the hardworking people of the United States and of our districts.

I think that particularly those of us in the Republican Party, most of us have led lives that keep us in touch with our constituents. We haven't spent a lifetime in Washington. We haven't advocated for being in Washington 5 days a week, out of touch with the American public.

There are a couple of things that have been said that I think have to be responded to today. They haven't been responded to properly in the last few weeks, I don't think.

One is the Clinton-squandered surplus. Let me remind the majority party that the reason we had a surplus during the third and fourth years of the Clinton administration was because there was a fiscally responsible Republican majority in the Congress. You cannot attribute the surplus to a President who has no control except to veto.

I want to say something about the waste of money on the war in Iraq. Were we not supporting those brave men and women who are currently serving not just in Iraq, but all over the world keeping us free, we wouldn't have the right to come to this floor and say the things that we say. The Federal Government was formed for the defense of this Nation. That is where money should be spent so we can maintain our freedom.

Nobody wants to be at war. I don't want to be at war. The President, I don't believe, wants to be at war. But we are at war because we were attacked. Those people have said repeatedly they want to destroy us; they want to destroy our way of life. We need to spend what we have to spend to keep our freedom. We don't have to raise these budgets by 10 percent to keep doing what we need to do for the American people.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I truly do apologize if the gentlewoman thought that the word "cast" was improper. I will speak to our Hollywood friends and ask them if it's improper to have a cast of individuals. It could be a cast of bad characters, or a cast of good characters. I am sure it is a cast of very dedicated folks who have a point to make and are trying to make it.

□ 1510

As far as whether or not we live away from our districts, any time that anyone on that side wants to compare backgrounds to how I grew up and how I got here and why I thank the good Lord that I am here every day, we can debate which public housing any member of the Republican Party grew up in, as I did, where they were born and how they grew up. So I take great pride in the fact that I managed to keep in touch, because it is very hard to lose your roots once you get to a certain place.

Now, the other thing we hear all the time is that whenever we say that we are wasting money in Iraq, that somehow is an insult on the troops. The greatest support we can give our troops is to bring them home tomorrow morning. That is the true support.

I want to see folks, 2, 3, 4, 5 years from now, when we have to pick up the tab and, rightfully so, deal with the wounded who come back from Iraq, if we are going to be standing here also trying to cut budgets the way we are now. But I suspect that it will be the same way that it happened after the Gulf War, where the folks who were all hot and bothered about sending folks off to war then didn't want to put any money into the Veterans' Administration or for services for our troops.

So using a phrase that my chairman would use, Mr. OBEY, don't lecture me, don't lecture any of us, on who cares for the troops. We all care for the troops. I would never question whether you care for the troops. It is just that we differ. You think that you care for the troops by keeping them there for as long as they have to be there, which may be 10 more years. I care for the troops by bringing them home tomorrow morning.

Lastly, it was my city that saw the largest part of the terrorist attack on September 11. The gentlewoman said we are in Iraq because we were attacked.

No. We are in Afghanistan, which I voted for us going there, because we

were attacked. We are in Iraq because we were lied to and half the Congress believed it. And now no one, not even the administration, admits in any way, shape or form that Saddam Hussein or anything that happened in Iraq had anything to do with September 11th.

The American people know that. They may think that we have to stay there a little longer. They may have whatever opinion they have. But the American people know that there is no relationship between Iraq and September 11th, and that is a fact. So we can continue to talk about how we have to keep spending this money. Not true.

This cut is a devastating cut to this bill. This bill is a responsible bill. This bill did what you claim you wanted to do. It came in below the President's request. I haven't heard one person get up and say, "My God, the President wanted more than SERRANO. SERRANO gave less than the President wanted, so he did pretty good, because boy, that President is a big spender."

No. He continues to be the fiscal conservative, and somehow we are the big spenders.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), the Republican Conference Chair.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the landscape of Washington is littered with the broken promises of the Democratic majority. We have heard an awful lot about fiscal discipline, but we just haven't found it yet.

This bill increases funding for the Federal Government by almost 9 percent over last year. Very few other household budgets or business budgets or private sector budgets grow at that rate.

We heard a lot over the last year, a lot of bold talk that turned into empty rhetoric, about the concept of fiscal discipline. Apparently our definitions of that term differ greatly, because the Democratic budget that these appropriations bills are implementing includes the largest tax increase in American history.

But they didn't stop there. They went on to say, despite what we may have said during the campaign, we want a new policy on earmarks. We want a policy on earmarks that prevents the American people from seeing them and that prevents the Members of Congress from having to vote on them until they mysteriously appear in the middle of the night in the conference report.

Fortunately, 2 weeks ago this body walked them back from that ill-conceived policy. And today, you can now hold your Member of Congress accountable for each and every one of the votes that they take on earmarks.

But they didn't stop there. They also, to make their budget move forward, de-

spite having the largest tax increase in American history, used these reserve funds that are empty. They have a Sticky Note in the bottom of them with an IOU.

They use these reserve funds to promise rural America, we will put \$20 billion more into the farm bill. Here is our IOU. It hasn't materialized. They told Americans in need, here is an additional pot of billions of dollars to fund SCHIP. It hasn't materialized. They did that on over 20 occasions, these mysterious reserve funds.

This bill is just one example of the reckless fiscal policy that the Democratic majority has charted for this country, a 9 percent year over year increase for Treasury, Postal, executive branch, the IRS, all very popular agencies in the American psyche right now.

They have promised America the largest tax increase in American history. They have promised the different constituent groups reserve funds, secret slush funds and IOUs, but they have delivered no accomplishment, no substantive policy change, nothing in the first 6 months of their rule. America deserves better.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a leader on fiscal discipline.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Again, I want to thank him for his leadership on this House floor in attempting to bring fiscal sanity in a place that desperately needs it.

Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the gentleman from New York and his comments, and I certainly appreciate the wit that he brings to this debate. Perhaps with the exception of him, I am somewhat curious from time to time why so many Members on this side of the aisle appear to be so grumpy, since they did win the last election.

The gentleman said that early on that he wasn't sure if we cared. We certainly care about the gentleman from New York. We just care even more about hard-working taxpayers in our districts.

He talks about the devastating cut that an amendment to level-fund this bill would be to the government. A devastating cut, when you are giving them exactly the same amount of money this year that you gave them last year. Webster must be spinning in his grave. I have actually looked up the definition of "cut" and it means "to reduce." So for level-funding this bill, I fail to see this thing called a cut.

What I do know is being cut is the family budget, because, as the gentleman from Ohio has aptly pointed out, there is all of this spending, a 9.9 percent increase, and somehow it is devastating, devastating, anything less than a 9.9 percent increase in this agency.

Well, how about the \$3,000 a year largest tax increase in history that this is part of? This spending, this 9.9 percent increase is being funded with this largest tax increase in history.

That is where the devastating cut is coming, Mr. Chairman, in the family budgets of American families all across the Nation. And that is what we are trying to prevent, and that is what we care about, and it is indeed a very serious subject.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the right to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just reiterate what the previous speaker said. Look, we heard the term "devastating cut." As the gentleman from Texas indicated, we want to level-fund. We don't want to give a \$550 million increase to the IRS. We want to level-fund the IRS and other agencies contained in this bill. It is not too much to ask government to do the same thing that taxpayers and families do all the time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in closing.

Mr. Chairman, much was said by the gentleman who spoke before about the earmarks once again. Well, he will have an opportunity, and so will all of us. There is an amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL pending striking all the earmarks from the bill. I certainly will be voting against that amendment, but I will be watching with much anticipation how folks on that side vote on that amendment, because that will get rid of every single earmark from the bill.

Secondly, it is a devastating cut. All of these are devastating cuts. Whether we like it or not, we will continue to remind you that the great amount of money that has been squandered here was the major tax cut that went to the wealthiest, the richest people in this country, and that you continue to support, and, secondly, the fact that you will not join us in getting out of Iraq so we can save that money that we are spending over there. That is a fact.

To bring that fight home on this bill, which came in below the President's request, is really a totally improper way to attack it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope every Member votes against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF  
GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX

#### REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 901. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$214,340,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues, at least on this side of the aisle, for working as diligently as possible to introduce amendments that will result in fiscal responsibility, or at least the start of fiscal responsibility, here in Washington.

This amendment is affectionately known as the Hefley amendment. A former Member here from Colorado, Mr. Hefley often introduced an amendment that would reduce the increase in appropriations bills by 1 percent. I suspect we will hear another cry of "devastating cuts" from the majority party, but in fact, Mr. Chairman, this is a minimal reduction for the Federal budget, but a huge win for the American people.

When we talk about amendments that are reducing appropriately the spending that goes on by the Federal Government, it is always important to remember whose money we are spending. This isn't the government's money. This is the people's money, and they work extremely hard to make certain that they can make their ends meet. And in so doing, they generously, they generously, provide the Federal Government with the resources with which to run our government and our country. It is incumbent upon us to be as responsible as possible with that spending. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we can be more responsible than we are being.

We have heard a lot of pronouns bantied about on the floor today, mostly "I" and "you." I wish, Mr. Chairman, we would have a few more "we's," because when we work together on behalf of the American people to decrease spending, to responsibly spend, what we do is come together in a way that I think the American people desire us to, and certainly I believe that is one of the messages they sent last November.

We have heard also discussions or comments saying this is a big waste of time. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would sug-

gest to you that any time we are fighting on behalf of the American taxpayer, that is not time wasted. I would also suggest that they don't believe that fighting on their behalf to make sure that the Federal Government spends less than is planned by this majority, that that is a waste of time.

Now, what is the big picture in this bill? The big picture is that last year the programs under this bill spent \$19.5 billion. The committee has come forward with a proposal to spend \$21.4 billion, an increase of \$1.9 billion, nearly 10 percent.

This amendment, this amendment that is before us right now, is to decrease that increase, that nearly 10 percent increase, decrease that increase by 1 percent. So it is not, it is not, something that could be described as a devastating cut.

The numbers again: Last year we spent \$19.5 billion. The committee proposes \$21.4 billion. When this amendment is enacted, we will spend \$21.2 billion on behalf of financial services and general government operations.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the American people have lost a great deal of trust, a great deal of trust, in our Federal Government, and part of that is the irresponsible way in which we spend the people's money. This is a small step, a small step forward in order to begin to regain that trust.

So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I will take a couple of minutes, and then what I want to do is reserve the balance of my time with the right to close, so there probably won't be a need to ask me if I have any more speakers for a while, or at all.

But this is, again, the same thing. It is yet another cut, another desire to say we should have gone deeper in our cuts. When I think of this, I wonder, if we should have come to where the President wanted. The President wanted \$243 million more. We decided in a proper way to come below the request of President Bush. Maybe we should have come at President Bush's level, and then you would be cutting his request more and more, rather than what I bring you today.

But, again, this is a devastating cut. There is no other word for it. You are going after a bill that is a bare-bones bill. There is no fat in here. Mr. REGULA, who worked on this with us, knows there is no fat in here. The cuts just pile up, and I understand what you are doing.

With that, I just hope that everybody will vote against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, before I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Georgia, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) be allowed to control the time for the remaining portion of the time for the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for offering this amendment.

You know, this is what I call fuzzy math. I think, Mr. Chairman, we need to explain this to people because the chairman of the subcommittee just asked the question, maybe you wanted us to go deeper in the cuts. Well, let me explain to the people, Mr. Chairman, that this is a 9.9 percent increase in fiscal year 2007. This is not a cut. And what the gentleman from Georgia is saying, let's just take 1 percent. Let's give a haircut of 1 percent to this budget. If you do the 1 percent, you will have an 8.9 percent increase. So it is not a cut. That is fuzzy math. That is smoke and mirrors. That is more sleight of hand when you are presenting this that we are asking for more of a cut. All we are saying is let's not increase by 9.9, let's only increase by 8.9.

Mr. Chairman, the American people need to be aware that sometimes in Washington when people talk about a cut, they are actually saying they are not getting as much of an increase as they want to have. Now, in a year's time for somebody to get a 10 percent raise or for a family to say, you know what, we can spend another 9.9 percent because we need it, so we will just go borrow the money, the majority says we are not borrowing the money. Okay. Well, I will go out and get an extra job to get more revenue. But the majority says, no, we are not doing it that way either. We are not raising taxes.

Well, if you spend more, you've either got to make more money or you have to go in debt. Or you've got to get more taxes in. So I think that is where we have a little bit of a dilemma here. We see the final answer, but we don't see the solution in how to get there, the math problem in how to get there. I can tell you the math problem that is going to get there. It is going to be a problem for the American family and the small businessman, because where this result comes from is the largest tax increase in American history.

So don't go for the smoke and mirrors, don't go for the sleight of hand, don't go for the wonderful sales job of we're not going to increase your taxes or increase the deficit, we're just making it happen.

Well, that sounds like a fairy tale. Sometimes up here I feel like I am in



Alice in Wonderland. I just want the American people to know that there is a group, that there are some of us that are trying to bring us back from Alice in Wonderland, trying to bring us back to a reality that we need to stop the big spending and the expansion of government.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) has 8½ minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Texas for asking me to speak on this bill again.

A few minutes ago Mr. RYAN was here and he had his children. When I spoke, I wanted to say something about the fact that they were here and how good it is that we have children on the floor and that we have young people watching what we are doing. They are here to remind us that the actions we take now are so important in the future because we are setting the stage for their future.

The majority party made a lot of promises last year on a lot of little issues, in my opinion, but they have done nothing to really fulfill those promises. They particularly have done nothing to deal with the long-term liabilities that we have facing us. We know that pretty soon 70 cents out of every dollar coming into the Federal Treasury is going to be dedicated to Medicaid, Medicare and Social Security or we won't be fulfilling the obligations we have made. So those children are going to be faced with tremendous responsibilities in dealing with those issues, and I think it is important that we acknowledge that.

The other thing I want to say is that one of my colleagues talked about wanting to compare notes on having lived in public housing projects. Without realizing it, I think he made one of my points for me. One of the problems that we have in this country is that the Federal Government is funding things it has no business funding. If the States and the localities want to subsidize housing for people, that is one thing. But having the Federal Government absorb that kind of responsibility, in my opinion, is not right.

My family didn't grow up in public housing. We never asked for public assistance. We did it on our own. We did without a lot of things, but we did it on our own. And I think we have to look for ways to help the American people learn to live without subsidies from the Federal Government.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, you know, I have been in this House 17 years. During those years, I have done what comes natural to me, which is to be a gentleman. In addition, I have tried very hard whenever I know that you may lose your temper a little bit to be a diplomat.

But I think when people try to twist people's words it is pretty sad.

The gentleman spoke about being out of touch. I said that when you grow up in a public housing project you stay in touch. She quickly did that right-wing thing about growing up on welfare. My parents worked hard. My father had 2 years of schooling. My mother was the highly educated one. She had 6. Both of them died before their 65th birthday.

They raised two kids. One has been with the Commerce Department, way before I got into Congress by the way, for many years; and this one is not doing too bad being a Member of Congress.

That wasn't welfare. It was a form of housing. To insult people who live in subsidized housing for the poor as some sort of welfare cheats is to demean the nature of the debate in this House.

I will always be proud of the years I spent in the Millbrook Projects in the South Bronx. I will be proud of my years in public school. I will be proud of the fact that I came to the United States not speaking English and that I learned to speak whatever it is that I speak now, whether it is good or bad English. I am proud of that.

But to suggest somehow that what we are doing here today in promoting expenditures in Iraq that are a waste of money, not in how we use them for the troops but how we got into that war, or suggesting that because in 2010 people making millions of dollars in this country may have a sunset provision which was set up by the Republican Party on their major tax break when it comes to an end so that they, the ones who make 20, 50, 100, 200 million a year, a billion, may have to pay a little more so that someone else can get a little health care, if that is what this debate is about, then we have reached a very, very low point.

Now, I probably will sit down after I speak and regret having said what I said because I don't like to engage on a personal basis, but if you ever want to know what public housing is like, it is not a vacation. It is not a cabin in the Catskill Mountains or on the Outer Banks of anywhere. It is a very difficult life, but a wonderful life because it teaches you a lot. I am the man I am today because I grew up in public housing. It was not welfare. It was not a gift. It was just the way it was. I resent personally anyone who tries to cheap-shot this situation by hiding behind any comments that I might have made.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

First, clearly the gentleman from New York is listening to a different debate than I am listening to. I very much did enjoy hearing his story, a story I was unacquainted with. I certainly honor all of those who come from common circumstances and can better themselves.

But there are many of us on this side of the aisle who think that the best

housing project, the best educational project, the best health care project is a job, and that is what the Republican budget helps create.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the Republican Conference Policy chairman, Mr. MCCOTTER.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to begin by echoing the sentiments of the gentleman from Texas. The distinguished gentleman from New York has much to be proud about, coming from humble circumstances and a difficult area, to come here to the people's House and serve his constituents. It not only shows the strength of character he has; it shows what the American Dream is all about. I give you your due, sir.

Talk about another man who came from humble circumstances, Dennis Vincent Patrick Mullen McCotter, my father. A man whose father was an Irish immigrant to this country, whose mother died when he was young and he and his brother and sister were sent to other families to stay, eventually winding up in the St. Francis Home for Boys. He got a football scholarship, worked his whole life to put his brother and sister through college, in addition to himself. He grew up and became a teacher, became a proud union Democrat.

He taught me something about government that I have never forgotten. He said government spends nothing. It is the American taxpayers who pay for everything. I recall a lot of talk last year about Federal spending being out of control. I could hear my father in my head reminding me that you are spending other people's money. The money does not belong to the government. And many people who have forgotten his simple wisdom paid a high price for that.

And yet today we find ourselves under the misconception that somehow this is money that belongs to the government as opposed to the people who pay the taxes. This is the only way I believe that we can come to logically reconcile the concept of a 9.9 percent increase in new domestic spending juxtaposed to the rhetoric that we heard so much last fall about trying to get Federal spending under control.

It would strike me that my father's advice on this would be: Remember, this is not your money. You are spending other people's money. And if you tell them that you are going to be fiscally responsible with the sweat of their brow, with their hard-earned money, you had better keep that promise. Because if you do not, another thing that my father, who continues to get much wiser as I get much older, taught me, fair is fair. And if the American people believe that the pines that were offered to fiscal sanity last year are not matched by the deeds in these appropriation bills, there will be many Members on the other side of the aisle who will find that they will forfeit a great deal for their lack of loyalty to their commitments.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on our side?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

□ 1545

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to say, I believe that the chairman of this committee has worked hard on this bill and done a good job, but I also know as a member of Appropriations that often things are thrust upon you as a committee member which may not have originated in the Appropriations Committee. I don't know if that's the case, but I would say here's four areas where we could go to come up easily with over 1 percent of this money. Four specific areas.

Number one is in the regulatory agencies. There have been increases above the request for the FTC, the FEC, the SEC and the CPSC, all agencies in which there is more money than requested. That's number one.

Number two, there's \$300 million in election assistance for States, unauthorized. There's already \$1 billion in unobligated funds from past appropriations bills. I did not like it when the Republican Appropriations Committee put this money out there for local election assistance because I don't think the Federal Government needs to stick its nose in that tent, because once the Federal Government gets involved in local State elections, it's a one-way street and we will have the federalization of elections.

The third spot. There's \$80 million in unrequested SBA subsidy. Now, the particular program has been run unsubsidized. The folks borrow the money. They pay it back. We are now creating a new subsidy for the SBA, \$80 million.

But the one that really bothers me the most is actually a presidential request. Now, my friend from New York has said no one has accused the President of being a big spender, but I will say to you, I agree with you. I believe the President has spent more money than the American people want him to and I believe we as Republicans spent more money than the American people wanted us to. And because I'm such a good friend of yours, I want to prevent you from making the same mistake.

The President has requested \$300 million in the new campus at St. Elizabeth's for the Department of Homeland Security. I want my friends in the RSC to know this is a \$3 billion, 10-year request to build a huge campus for the Department of Homeland Security. We did not fund this last year. We should all join together and say "no" to the Department of Homeland Security on this \$3 billion campus which is sure to become worse than the CVC in cost overruns over time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's very important that we focus on exactly what the question is before us. The question before us, with the amendment from the gentleman from Georgia, is will we grow the Financial Services appropriations by 9.9 percent or will we grow it by 8.9 percent? So when you hear the discussion of the devastating cuts and what this will do to all these fundamental government programs, how many families in America would love to have a cut that resulted in an 8.9 percent increase in their family income?

Even more fundamental, Mr. Chairman, this amendment will set us on two paths. One path, if we reject this amendment, leads to the largest tax increase in American history, \$3,000 per American family. The other path will lead us to a balanced budget, the Republican budget, without raising taxes on hardworking American people.

Let's support and approve the amendment from the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, these agencies, these regulatory agencies in this bill, are not very well known by the American people, but I think this amendment is consistent with the efforts made by Republican Congresses in the past 25 years to slowly but surely weaken and cripple the ability of regulatory agencies to keep the big boys honest and to protect the little people in this society from abuse and to protect legitimate capitalists from chiseling competitors.

If you take a look at what happened to the Federal Trade Commission and the Consumer Product Safety Commission, for instance, from 1980 on, the protective capacity of the antitrust division at the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission was being shrunk at the same time that America experienced the greatest wave of corporate mergers and corporate acquisitions in the Nation's history. The staff of the Consumer Product Safety Commission during that time was cut in half, since 1980.

And as I said last night, the ability of the SEC to keep up with its workload was crunched because over that same period of time corporate filings reviewed by the Agency declined from 21 percent to about 8 percent in 2000. That means the rest of the filings never even got a look-see.

Now, the Federal Trade Commission: its job is simply to protect the consumers, to protect them against antitrust and a variety of noncompetitive practices. The SEC is charged with the responsibility of protecting investors, so we don't have more Enrons. And the Consumer Product Safety Commission does all these "terrible" things like protecting kids from flammable pajamas.

I would simply suggest that you can cut this bill by 1 percent and it won't be noticed much in any immediate year. But you do that for 4 or 5 years in a row and you allow inflation meanwhile to eat away at those regulatory agencies' budgets, and what you have is runaway, ragged individualism and you have the big boys and the big corporations in this society able to get away with murder. These are the agencies that keep those big boys honest.

Now, they say, "Well, this is just a small cut." I would submit we have already cut this bill 3 percent. We cut the President's budget by 3 percent.

And I would further make the point that I think it is a ludicrous joke for the people in this Congress who brought us \$1.2 trillion in tax cuts, paid for with borrowed money, for the people who are willing to give \$57 billion in tax cuts this year to people who make over a million bucks, with borrowed money, and for people who are willing to borrow \$600 billion to finance the dumbest war in modern American history, and then they want to divert public attention by saying, "Oh, guess what, we didn't cause the \$2 trillion increase in Federal debt. What caused it was these terrible Democrats who are in the coming year going to add \$5 billion over the CBO baseline." That's all the budget does for this year, add \$5 billion over the CBO baseline.

So I plead fully guilty of thinking that added investments in veterans, added investments in school kids, added investments in health care, added investments in science, added investments in budgets that help regulatory agencies keep the big boys honest, I plead fully guilty in supporting all of that. It's a whole lot better than their track record on fiscal responsibility.

It is a colossal all-time joke. Never again in my life will I take any lectures from any members of that party on fiscal responsibility after what they've done the last 6 years. You can rewrite history if you want, but ain't nobody gonna read it!

Mr. SERRANO. How much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 10½ minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I won't take that, but I want to close. The gentleman has no more time on the other side, I understand?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the other side.

Mr. SERRANO. I just want to follow up on what Chairman OBEY has said because that's the first thing that came to mind when I heard my friend, Mr. KINGSTON, make the comments that he made. One of the in-house publications said, and I'm trying to remember the headline, after reading our bill, said "Democrats move towards more consumerism," or "to protect consumers."

You know, Mr. Chairman, if we do nothing else in this subcommittee for the next 20 years and all we have,

Chairman OBEY, as that headline says, that this subcommittee moved to protect the consumer, we did the right thing.

Under Chairman OBEY's leadership, we were asked to hold a series of thematic hearings. Those hearings were to see how government can come closer to the people and the people closer to the government. Those hearings were set out to find out the best way over a 5, 10-year span of time to see how we can begin to gear government to service the people.

So what did we do? Yes, we increased dollars for the agencies to protect the consumer. Agencies that have been devastated for the last few years. Devastated. And now we simply are saying that those agencies will now begin to pay more attention to the consumer. That is a good thing.

You've heard people on this House floor talk about issues having to do with products that come in from other countries that are not safe, everything from food items to toys to clothing. This is a good thing. And I tell you one thing. If you pay attention to what we do this year, if you pay attention to what we will try to do in conference, if you pay attention to next year's bill and the year after that, there will be a prevailing theme in language and in dollars, but mostly in language, directing the agencies to pay attention to the protection of the consumer.

We also did something else that goes hand in hand with that. We looked at the agencies and said, you know, there are things you can do to help the average American understand government and be serviced by government. So some people may take it lightly that we've asked all agencies to see how much time they can spend in the classroom, in schools, visiting schools, participating with the men and women of the future. They may say, "Well, that's not a function of government." It is. These agencies can go and participate in the schools.

We asked the Election Assistance Commission, for instance, to encourage schools at every level to use the same voting equipment that is used in local elections. Why do we do that? Because it's not improper to have a child in the eighth grade or in high school using the same equipment that he or she will be asked to use when they turn 18 and they're eligible to vote. These are not bad suggestions. These are pro-consumer suggestions. And so we stand proud behind them and we think it's a proper thing to do.

These cuts attack all of that. These cuts attack our vision for bringing government closer to the people. That's why I oppose this amendment, and I would hope all other Members do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KINGSTON:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with an entity that does not participate in the basic pilot program described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has reserved a point of order against the amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. What this amendment does, Mr. SERRANO and my fellow Members, it seeks to say that if you are doing business with the Federal Government, if you are a contractor building something or selling something to the Federal Government, then you should have a Social Security verification for your employees. This was inspired by two things: Number one, the fact that the American people have spoken. They do not want comprehensive immigration reform. They spoke so loudly and so well that even the United States Senate eventually heard their voices.

Now, we've heard their voices in the House and we have passed lots of immigration reform measures, such as fences, such as the REAL ID Act, some other things that we have put on all the bills on a bipartisan basis. What this says, though, is that if you're the contractor building the fence on the border, as we have had a real case, then you have to make sure that you have legal immigrants, legal people, working for you.

□ 1600

That's all it is. There are a lot of people who sell to the Federal Government in the school lunch program. There are a lot of people who work for the defense, a lot of people who work for these agencies, a lot of just different contractors who may have illegal aliens working for them on a Federal Government job, and the only thing

that this does is says that those contractors have to be involved in the basic pilot program, which is a program in which technology enables these employers to check Social Security numbers for authenticity within about 90 seconds.

It's very simple, it's very clear. I hope that the gentleman will accept it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI because it requires a new determination.

And I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on this point of order?

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination with regard to an entity's participation in a certain pilot program.

The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS.

MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 901. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act (including Federal funds contained in titles IV and VIII) that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to the Financial Services appropriations bill today would make a cut of just one-half of 1 percent in the overall funding of the bill.

Again, when I walk around the Halls of Congress, and I see signs on easels by Blue Dog Democrat doors and other individuals, it is pointed out to anyone that walks by that our national debt now is at \$8.8 trillion.

I offer this amendment in the tradition of our former colleague, Joel Hefley from Colorado, who faithfully came to the floor on these appropriations bills and offered a 1 percent cut, just a 1 percent cut in our spending.

Government does not have a revenue problem. What we have is a spending problem.

You know, when I listen to my colleagues, my friends on the other side of the aisle, and heard the esteemed chairman of the Appropriations Committee talk, he said something, if we cut our spending, we would have, I believe his term was, exactly this, runaway rugged individualism.

You know, as we approach the 4th of July and this holiday that's coming up, the celebration of the Declaration of Independence, I think about what has made this country great. I think one of the main things that has made this country great is rugged individualism.

What you have here is two opinions, two views of what makes this country great, and what the role of government should be.

I don't think there are many Americans, when they really think about it, wanting the government to advise them on how to buy a car and how to make decisions for themselves. I think Americans can take care of these things themselves. But will we have a bill like this when we have a 9.8 percent increase in spending over last year's amount? That's \$1.9 billion.

I wonder if the taxpayers think that they need to spend money in these kinds of ways. One of the things that caught my eye was a \$550 million increase in funding for the IRS. That's a 5 percent increase over last year's budget figure. There's not too many of us that would want to go home and brag about that.

So I think that we need to tighten our belt. I think we need to think about the proper role of government, what government should really do, strong national defense, our roads and our infrastructure, and wonder how government got involved in all of this and why, in this year's appropriations bill, we have to increase spending by \$1.9 billion.

My amendment would humbly take it from a 9.8 percent increase in spending to 9.3 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I will be brief, but I think part of what you hear from the other side is an innovative way of using the English language. So they speak about cuts and increases and tax increases and in a way which doesn't necessarily speak to reality. So let me try the same thing then. I might as well.

The President wanted \$243 million more than this bill that comes to you today.

Therefore, I would say, I cut the President. But I haven't seen one of you get up to say that was a good thing.

The President wanted \$243 million more in our bill than what we are pre-

senting to you. Therefore, the President took a cut. Mr. Chairman, I know I am not supposed to speak to them, I want to see them do the same thing when the President proposes more money for Iraq and for that war that was based on lies and bad information, and see if you are willing to cut that.

Secondly, you keep saying that this bill is 8, 9, 10 percent above last year. Again, a play on the English language, because this bill did not exist last year.

This is a new subcommittee. This committee is composed of different agencies that were put together for this committee.

Therefore, technically speaking, this is the first budget we give you. Next year, you can either say that I cut it or I increased it, but not this year, because this bill did not involve anything from last year.

Now, you could say, now he is getting picky. But if you listen to their proposals for the last couple of weeks, that's what they have been doing. They have been discussing these issues that have nothing to do with anything.

Again, you are going after a bill that came in very tight, a bill that came in below the President's request, a bill that funds basic services, a bill that has 80 percent of its funding for administrative operations in 25 different agencies. There is no fat here; there is no waste of money here.

Do you want to discuss waste of money? Later on we can discuss the war in Iraq, and we can discuss the tax cuts for millionaires that we have in place. That is the real waste of money, but we won't touch that. We will continue to bash this poor little bill that came in under the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the gentlelady for Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for as much time as she may consume.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank the gentlelady from Colorado for yielding to me and for bringing this important measure forward.

I want to thank Ranking Member REGULA for the hard work that he has done on this bill, and also to the chairman for the work that he has done as well.

I have to say that I hope that my ears deceive me in the remarks that I just heard from the chairman. It almost sounded as though the chairman was calling the President of the United States a liar in his remarks. I certainly hope that that wasn't true. If so, I would call on him to take down his remarks, and I trust that that is not the intention of the chairman in his previous remarks.

Mr. Chairman, what I would like to say in the course of my moments before this body is that I believe that all of us are trying to do the best that we can for regular Americans. What the gentlelady from Colorado is trying to do is exceptional.

We had an amendment that was offered previously by Mr. JORDAN of

Ohio, an excellent amendment that called to have spending at 2007 levels. That makes perfect sense for most of the people in this country, because many people, many businesses, don't have that opportunity to be able to increase their budget at all, let alone to this level of 9.9 percent.

In fact, I will tell you, just in my home State of Minnesota, we have Northwest Airlines, a wonderful, marvelous employer that's had to deal with unbelievable problems since 9/11.

With all of the events that have occurred, that have happened to airlines, their employees have had to endure incredible cuts in their salary. The pilots union, the mechanics union, the stewardesses union, all of them have had to endure cuts. They haven't even been able to stay the same at previous years' levels on their wages, much less increase by 9.9 percent their wages, or, as our colleague, Dr. PRICE, wanted to cut that increase by 1 percent, 9.9, back to 8.9. Now the gentlelady from Colorado wants to back it off just one-half a percent.

Surely this body should see the wisdom in the gentlelady's amendment. All she wants to do is just have a modicum of economy in her amendment. Surely we should be able to see the wisdom in that.

I have a businessman who has a legacy industry that feeds into the auto industry. He has a business in Minnesota, and he has had to cut costs so dramatically that their business will literally almost go by the wayside if they can't turn things around.

Again, what we are seeing, with businesses, with family, especially in my home State of Minnesota, businesses not only can't increase their expenses by 9.9 percent. They can't increase it by 9.5, 8.9 percent, they can't increase at all. They have to cut back. That's called productivity. That's what America is about. That's one thing Americans do so well. They find more economical ways to produce more with less.

Usually in the course of that, when businessmen are involved in that sort of an adventure, they are somehow able to pay their employees a little bit more by being more productive. They can't always do that, but sometimes that can occur.

Here in this situation, the gentlelady from Colorado just has a very simple goal, and that is just to decrease by 0.5 percent the amount that's being proposed.

The budget is all about people. At the end of the day, it's the people in my district and your district that are paying this big spending spree, almost 10 percent increase in spending over the last year. It's almost as though the people in Congress believe that if at the end of your name you have a comma, and the letters I-n-c period, that this body believes that there is an unending checkbook that this body can dive into and pull a wallet out of a business and say, you've got more.

So we year after year after year go back to the same well. We go back to the American taxpayer. We go back to American business, and we continue to put burdens on them such that we dig into their wallet and think there is more where that came from.

There is not more where that came from. We looked at the budget battle earlier in this year. In the budget that the majority proposed, there wasn't one attempt to address the problem that we have with unfunded net liabilities that are coming across this Congress in future years, unfunded net liabilities with Social Security, unfunded net liabilities with Medicare. These are very real costs that we are going to have to deal with. This majority in Congress didn't look at that in its bill.

So it's almost as though this Congress is saying we are going to see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil. We are making a conscious decision, it seems, to just ignore the very real threat of economic, unfunded net liabilities that are facing this Congress.

I submit again to this body that what the gentlelady is trying to do in her very forward-looking amendment is wise. She is saying let's just pull back a little bit on this grand spending spree and be kind to Americans. Let's be kind to American industry, kind to the American taxpayer and say we understand your plight. We understand that you do more with less, and we are going to do the same.

I would say let's not have the largest tax increase in American history that our friends across the aisle are proposing. Let's not have the largest spending increase in American history. Let's do what Americans do so beautifully, and that's let's be productive. Let's increase productivity, not by government spending more, but by making sure that we return more money to the American taxpayer and say, you know what? We can do what New Zealand did just very recently.

□ 1615

We can take reform. We can actually do something completely revolutionary, and it would be that we would look at every government program and say, justify what you're doing is right. Justify that what you're doing is helping the American consumer; you're achieving objectives. Instead of the other way around, which is continuing to add more money, in this case, 10 percent, almost 10 percent more increase in a program, without first causing those programs to justify that they're helping the American people.

And that's why I'm so proud of the gentlelady from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). She's just trying to bring a very commonsense rationalization to the spending that's being proposed by this body.

If we can't do what Mr. JORDAN suggested which, in itself, was very wise, go with 2007 level of spending, which for a lot of American companies, they'd

love to be able to have 2007 level of spending. They can't do that. They've got to cut back even more just to stay afloat.

Or do what was proposed by Dr. PRICE, which is cut back 1 percent of spending. We can't even cut back, as the gentlelady from Colorado proposes, by one-half a percent?

We can do better than that. In my short time here in Congress, one thing I've seen is that, no matter if it's on the Republican side of the aisle or the Democrat side of the aisle, there's a lot of really smart people in this chamber. And I believe that we can do better, Mr. Chairman. And I believe that the gentlelady has a very wise, very commonsense approach, and I would think that the majority body could certainly accede to the fact that we can cut back by one-half a percent, so that we're now going to be spending, then, about 9.4 percent increase.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I still reserve.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Could I ask the chairman how much time remains for either side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 3½ minutes and the gentleman from New York has 12 minutes.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to our distinguished deputy whip from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. I rise in support of the gentlelady's amendment because, as has been so eloquently said prior, the fact that this amendment simply attempts to cut .5 percent from the extraordinary levels of expenditure in this bill. It amounts to a \$107 million reduction in the rate of growth of spending. Again, a \$107 million reduction in the rate of growth. So instead of the bill growing, since last year, by 9.9 percent, the bill will then grow by 9.4 percent. That's all we're talking.

Points have been made that if the average American family is faced with a requirement that they reduce their budget by .5 percent, I think everyone, everyone who has a job and can do that would do that. And that is the situation we're in.

I want to respond to some of the remarks that were made by the chairman when he said that this is just another effort by the GOP to somehow cripple agencies that help poor people, that help people who can't help themselves. You know, that is just not the case. We are in support and have continued to be, our side of the aisle continues to be supportive of American families to allow them to take control of their own future, and for us here in Congress to recognize that the government doesn't spend government money, it spends taxpayer money. That's the bottom line.

We cannot just sit here and think that we can solve everybody's problem just by having government step in and do it. So this is taking a very reasonable approach to say, okay, let's go ahead and cut by .5 percent.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the committee if he has any more speakers.

Mr. SERRANO. Just to close.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I would yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I just want to tell Mr. Chairman that I hope Mr. PRICE is listening because it is going to take a lot of truth squad to straighten this out.

The chairman over here mentioned the Iraq spending and wanted to see how much we would cut it. Well, when the President sent down the emergency Iraq spending bill the Democrats went "Yee-Haw," let's add \$23 billion to it.

So I want to quote what the chairman and the subcommittee chairman has said. "Don't lecture me on spending on the war."

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) for the remainder of the time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I stand here today to say that it's amazing, as I listened on my TV in my room and then came over here and heard complaints about cutting just .5 percent. I heard talks about runaway rugged individualism. And I had to think that what we're talking here is concern runaway rugged individualism versus a nanny state regulatory state, a nanny state that says we can't do for ourselves what we could and should do for ourselves.

And to talk about cutting this miniscule cut that would at least start to establish for our taxpayers that we have heard to some degree, and .5 percent is what we could take away and indicate that if we want to move in that direction, not only will we say to the taxpayer, you will do well if we keep moving that direction, but I think we can prove to the regulatory mentality here that we can live without some of that.

We're talking about myself in a State of Michigan, where we are hurting for certain, and it's not because we don't have too little government. It's not because we don't have too little regulation. We've got too much. We've got too much taxation. We've got too much spending. We've got too much regulation that continues to break down what we should and could do for ourselves.

So I thank the gentlelady from Colorado for sponsoring this very reasonable amendment that just simply says, come on. We're still going to have a significant increase. Let's move forward. And I thank you for offering it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado's time has expired.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I just want to, first of all, comment that I must have hit a nerve in telling the truth, because the gentleman from Georgia got so excited that he made some noise that I'm trying to figure out later what it means. Something, hee-haw or haw-hee or

something. I'll try to figure it out later.

But anyway, the point is that no one is lecturing anyone. The ones who've been doing lecturing, Mr. Chairman, have been people saying that these bills have to be cut. These bills are bare-bone bills. This one in particular came in under the President's request, cut the President's request by \$245 million.

We set out to help agencies to help people. We demand, we encourage them, actually, to come closer to the people. We do a lot to allow the District of Columbia to deal with some of its issues, something that Mr. REGULA and I believe in strongly. That's what this bill does.

But we still can't get away from the fact that when we deal with cuts, you could present it any way you want. There's only one cut where the American people will actually feel something happening, and that is if you cut this continued ability to allow only the richest people in the country, the millionaires and the zillionaires to get incredible tax cuts where they take home 160,000 more dollars than they took last year, or 220,000 more dollars than they took home last year; or if you ever get the courage to say to President Bush, this is your war, you started this war, we have to end the pain of the war, but in the process, we have to end the continuing waste. And I say waste, because it shouldn't have been there in the first place, of half a trillion dollars. That's a lot of money.

Cutting the Consumer Product Safety Commission, cutting the FCC, cutting the SEC, cutting the Small Business Administration, that's not going to make a difference, and you know it.

Let's have the courage to tell the President to get out of Iraq and save half a trillion dollars that he will now spend if we stay there, and then we're talking real dollars.

I hope that everybody will oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GOODE

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 32 offered by Mr. GOODE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

# TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the Federal funds made available in title IV or VIII may be used to implement or enforce the Health Care Benefits Expansion Act of 1992 (D.C. Law 9-114; D.C. Official Code, section 32-701 et seq.).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, under Federal law, and the law of most States, legal marriage is the union between a man and a woman. The U.S. House of Representatives should be on record supporting traditional marriage between a man and a woman and opposing alternative definitions of marriage.

Federal tax dollars are not used to extend employment benefits to domestic partners of Federal employees, and D.C. should not enjoy an exception to the rule.

Since 1992, Congress has prohibited the use of Federal funds from being used to implement the D.C. Domestic Partners Law. And I hope it will be the privilege of this body to adopt this amendment and keep a 15-year tradition in place.

I yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of the American people believe that marriage is a sacred union between a man and a woman. This most basic social institution has been recognized by every culture and every serious religion in the history of mankind.

The Goode amendment protects and strengthens this important union between a man and a woman, and I rise in strong support of it.

The underlying bill before us today strips a 15-year Federal policy ensuring that American taxpayer dollars are not used to fund domestic partnership benefits. In defense of this longstanding policy, the President's senior advisors have made clear that they will recommend a veto if the bill reaches the President's desk in its current form, with this item in it.

Mr. Chairman, Federal funds have never been used for domestic partnership benefits in the District of Columbia. If this bill is not amended, the Federal Government will be forced, for the first time ever, to offer many of the same benefits for domestic partnership as it offers for marriage.

I oppose using government funds to promote nonmarital partnerships because I have tremendous respect for the traditional family. I believe that traditional marriage is the foundation of the family, and families are the foundation of healthy society. The Goode amendment protects these vital foundations which we, as the representatives of the people, should support. I

strongly urge my colleagues to support it. It clearly defines the difference in the two parties here in the Congress. Please vote "yes" on the Goode amendment.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I was going to rise in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. And I guess for all intents and purposes, I have to do that, except that when I read the amendment, I realized that, with all due respect to the gentleman, it doesn't change anything because it speaks to something that doesn't exist. There's nothing in this bill that says that anything can be done that he doesn't want done.

I know that's confusing. I showed it to Chairman OBEY because I wanted to make sure. He agrees with me. I showed it to staff and, to my amazement, I was right with everybody. This amendment speaks to an issue that is not an issue; therefore, he's asking to undo something that is not done. Nothing's broken that needs to be fixed.

□ 1630

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, based on what the gentleman from New York said, I hope it would be the privilege of this body to vote "yes" for this amendment to uphold traditional marriage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2829) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 179) and ask for its immediate consideration.



The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 179

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, June 28, 2007, or Friday, June 29, 2007, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, July 10, 2007, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Friday, June 29, 2007, Saturday, June 30, 2007, Sunday, July 1, 2007, or Monday, July 2, 2007, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 9, 2007, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 517 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2829.

□ 1635

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 32 by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

#### TITLE IX

##### ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to implement a Spanish-language version of the "Where's my Refund?" service.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 27, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a simple amendment that none of the funds made available in this act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to implement a Spanish language version of the Where's my Refund? service.

Mr. Chairman, the English language has been one of the strongest, most durable ties that unites us all as Americans. Yet today our unity in the English language is undermined by policies that require government agencies to communicate in an increasing number of foreign languages. It is not just one, two, or three. In some of the cases, it is five, and six languages.

So I rise today to offer an amendment to strike language in the underlying bill that would mandate even more government multilingualism. My amendment would prohibit the IRS from developing a Spanish language version of the agency's Where's my Refund? Web site, which is currently only offered in English.

So think about that. As it turns out now, if you want to get a refund, you go to the IRS Web site, and sure enough, you can find out how to do it. English is right there. You go through the procedure and understand it. But now in the bill, they want to put it into Spanish. So I am just saying let's continue with the status quo and keep it in English.

Taxpayers should not be required to pay the cost of translating information so that people can demand a tax refund in another language. This is our country and we want to promote English, and I am sure most people that want to get a refund, of all things, would like to learn English so they can get their refund. Generations of immigrants have made great sacrifices to learn English and assimilate into this great American "melting pot." This is what has allowed us to become the most successful multiracial and multiethnic Nation in the world.

Making exceptions now for another language I don't think is the right thing to do. It just assumes they are incapable of learning English like the previous generations. And many, many immigrants that came here learned English, and for all these years they have been able to determine what their refund was by going forward. So I think it is not a good idea to change this tradition. I realize that there are lots of people who don't agree with me,

but I think we should have a vote on this to understand it and have the will of the House.

Now, California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger knows something about the importance of learning English. He emigrated to the United States from Austria knowing very little English. He has said he immersed himself in American culture and made an effort to only speak English once he came to the United States. So he is a good example.

We should be encouraging immigrants to learn English, not enabling them by providing more and more government services in various foreign languages. It could be one language here, another language here, and pretty soon taxpayers are forced to deal with many, many languages just to get their refund.

Additionally, what makes Spanish speakers in this country more deserving than perhaps people from South Korea or people from Japan or people from China? I mean, is there one particular reason we are singling out this one language? If it is true we need to have this and I don't think we do, then I certainly think we should solve the problem of looking at all the languages.

The policy of our government should be to conduct official business in English and uphold the longstanding credo of "E Pluribus Unum": out of many, one. My amendment, I believe, simply would further this goal, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help preserve our national linguistic unity and strengthen our democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of amendment that shows up every so often. It plays to our patriotic feelings and to our feelings of wanting to be good Americans. So what you tell Americans is that if a language other than English is used anywhere in the country for any purpose, somehow, as the gentleman says, it attacks our democracy and threatens our democracy.

We are not saying that we want people to stay away from learning to speak English, and I think it is important to note that when people come into this country and what some folks go through to come into this country, that is a statement about how much they want to be in this country. Is it true that Mom and Dad may take a little longer to speak English? Absolutely. But the young man that comes in or the young woman that comes in at the age of 8, 9, 10, 12, whatever, I assure you that 10 months after they are here, they are acting very American and a year or two later they are speaking English. That's a fact of life.

In fact, I know this for a fact as one who spoke Spanish before he spoke English. When Hispanics sit around the dinner table and the issue of language comes up, it has never been a plot against the English language. It is usually the lament by the grandmother that the grandchildren no longer speak Spanish. That is the reality of America. That is how it has been from day one. That is how it is always going to be.

Now, what is it that we provide here? We are saying that if you still have not reached that point where you feel comfortable enough in English to deal with government services, you can go to a Web site, listen to this, and say, Where is my tax refund? That in itself makes a statement. It says you are working in this country, that you are paying taxes in the country, that you have a refund coming, and you want to know where your refund is. So to make it easier for you to communicate and get that service, the IRS has seen fit to put together that kind of a service.

Now, folks who deal with the IRS on a regular basis like the IRS National Taxpayers Advocate, in the annual report earlier this year, commended the IRS for the efforts to establish a Spanish-language version of Where's My Refund?

So if you don't like the fact that this service is provided, say that. That's fine. But don't make it sound like this is a threat to our democracy. This country is strong for what it is and who we are, not because we have a website that allows people, who speak Spanish and feel a little more comfortable as they transition into English, get this kind of information.

What is ironic is that we come to the House floor and make all these comments about government agencies offering Spanish as a language, but, Mr. Chairman, none of our colleagues from the other side ever get up and criticize their friends in corporate America who on a daily basis advertise in Spanish.

Do you know that there is an ESPN in Spanish, there is an ESPN Deportes in Spanish? There's a Fox, yes, a Fox News in Spanish. There's a Fox Sports, I said Fox, in Spanish. There's a People magazine in Spanish.

Now, is that government doing that or is that corporate America, who at times hangs out more with that side than this side, doing what they know is correct to sell their products? All these folks are saying is to give a service to the people, we will do it in Spanish too. Trust me, this does not threaten the democracy at all.

I am, on a personal level, kind of a little shocked at my friend, the only man who ever passed a ball to me in a congressional basketball game because he knows of my lack of talent, and he knows he's my friend, but you would think he comes from another State. He comes from Florida.

I don't know how you are going to explain this back home. I am trying to help you here. Maybe you want to

withdraw this amendment so you can save a lot of headaches back home.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1645

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STEARNS. Let me just move to use the 1½ minutes I have remaining and say to my sage colleague from New York that I certainly respect him. He's one of my favorite Members. We have lots of fun together. And I remember when he made those three pointers in the congressional basketball team how surprised, and pleasantly surprised, I was that he made them. So I'm respectful of that.

But I ask him, shouldn't government treat everybody equally? I mean, here you're talking about setting aside a special program, Where is My Refund program, under the IRS for the Spanish language. But I call the gentleman's attention to New York City. There are Chinese, almost 400,000 Chinese; 300,000 Italians; there are almost 250,000 Russians, there's 152,000 Frenchmen, Polish is a language there. The French Creole is about 100,000. Korean is about 86,000, German is about 86,000. In fact, the total number of people speaking foreign languages in his area, New York City, other than Spanish is 1.7 million people. So why shouldn't the government treat everybody equal is the question for you?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. May I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 30 seconds.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we've just heard one of the least persuasive arguments that we have ever heard in this body. We hear them repeatedly. People who are opposed to doing something use the argument that we shouldn't do it, even though they're objecting to it on its own basic grounds because it doesn't go far enough. If, of course, it went far enough, they would be even more upset, Mr. Chairman.

The argument that if you cannot solve every problem for everybody, you should not try to improve the situation for large numbers of people is never what people really think. It is always advanced by people who don't want fully to defend the position they take. The objection is to accommodating the many millions of Americans for whom Spanish is the primary language.

I have to say, I do not understand the impulse to make life harder for others when making it easier for them has no cost to us. I represent a large number of people who speak English. Nobody has ever said to me, you know what?

My life is now more difficult because people who speak primarily Spanish can get a refund.

What is the impulse that drives us to object to making life easier for many of our hardworking fellow citizens in some principle when it comes at no cost to us?

And by the way, I have a large number of people for whom Portuguese is a primary language. I do not think they will tell me, when I go back to march in parades in that area, we're very upset because you supported allowing tens of millions of our Spanish-speaking friends this advantage and you didn't do everything for us. It is, of course, reasonable for a community to take into account large numbers.

And so again, I am really troubled by this lashing out at our fellow citizens when it comes at no cost to the rest of us. You talk about benefit cost analysis. What is the cost, it's minimal, of letting people who work hard who have trouble with the English language?

And as the gentleman from New York has pointed out, overwhelmingly the younger people learn English. No one who has had any association with an immigrant community has any doubt about the accuracy of what he said. The young people learn English, they become the translators and interpreters for their parents and their grandparents.

There are people who came to America out of love for this country and they work hard, and they are much more comfortable, particularly reading sort of technical information, in the language they grew up with than the new language. Their children and those who come after will speak English. Why do we want to make their lives harder? Why this objection to trying to ease the transition for these people?

I very much hope this amendment is defeated. I would hope we would say we are a better country than to begrudge people who have taken the difficult decision to immigrate to make their lives better, this very small accommodation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SERRANO. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Massachusetts, my friend, makes the best point of all. If you can just imagine, and I think you do because Lou Dobbs and other people show you all the time, what some people go through to get to this country, not to mention others who enter here with documents. You don't go through all of that to decide later that you don't want to be part of this society and not speak English. That is a fallacy. That is not true. And I can tell you firsthand it doesn't happen.

I can tell you that I go to community meetings now in my district where there is no need any longer to say a word in Spanish other than to sound cute at the beginning by saying, *Hola. Como esta, Ustedes?*

This is not a problem. And I am trying to save you, once again, from all this wrath you're going to get back in

Florida for proposing this. So I still give you a chance to withdraw this. I hope everybody will vote against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio for his kindness.

We can wrap up this debate and I will just try to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New York here.

What can be more of an incentive to learn English? But the IRS program Where is My Refund? You would think if you are getting money back from the government, isn't that enough of an incentive to learn English? Maybe we should not have Spanish on the IRS Web site so we can get people to learn English. I mean, I would think giving them money back would be a great incentive. I would think you would be for this amendment because people who have to speak Spanish would have an incentive to learn English. That's my first point.

Second of all, the gentleman from Massachusetts says it's a minor cost. We don't know if this is a minor cost. But as we take his argument a little further, he says that I have no right to say there's another 1.7 million people in New York who speak other languages, and because the perfect is the enemy of good, we've got to give it to all these people, which is an argument that makes it confusing to people and say well, you have to vote against Stearn's amendment because we're not doing it for all these people. There certainly would be a cost if we went ahead and did it for 1.7 million various languages in Italian, Russian, French, Polish, French Creole, Korean and German.

And I ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), why is one language selected to do this at the expense of another 1.7 million? Which goes to my point. We shouldn't do it for only one, we need not do it for any of them.

And so there is no reason to do the other languages here. They're getting money back. It would be very expensive if we did it for all the languages. And the cost here, we don't know what it's going to be. So I think the country is better off if we treat everybody equally.

The question you mention, Mr. SERRANO, about CNN and other news organizations, these are private companies, they are not taxpayers funded. This is taxpayers funded. And I would think if a person is speaking French Creole in New York, he would like to have it in his language for the tax refund program, also.

So, I mean, you really make a difficult argument if you're saying it's

just for people who are Spanish and you're not recognizing all of them, which goes to the heart of my argument, which is, basically the United States Government should treat everybody equal. The language should be the English language, and particularly when you're talking about the Where is My Refund program with the IRS. Vote for the Stearns amendment.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have left of my own and how much time I left of Mr. REGULA? If that's possible to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. REGULA has 2 minutes left, and the gentleman from Florida has 30 seconds.

Mr. SERRANO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I would be glad to yield Mr. REGULA's time if Mr. REGULA will yield.

Mr. REGULA. Yes, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SERRANO. If you're willing to join me in a further amendment that says we should do 125 languages, I would be glad to join you because I believe in that. That's fine. That's because I don't know what you're really saying there.

Mr. STEARNS. Are you saying 25 languages?

Mr. SERRANO. 125, that's what you said; we should do it for everybody. So that's 125 languages.

My other point, because I don't want to take up your time, is, it's interesting to note how the language changes. Now you're saying they're getting money back from the government, they should be happy to do that in English. Just a few minutes ago, for 3 days, for 3 weeks we heard how the government only holds the money from the taxpayer. So only this group is getting money back from the government, the rest of the Nation is just having the government hold their money.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for his final 30 seconds.

Mr. STEARNS. I would just say, if you're speaking French Creole in your congressional district and you got a refund, you would certainly want that to be in our language, too.

I think I've made the argument clear that with all these different languages, the government should not pick out any one and should just do it in the official language, which is English.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, thank you for your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 30 seconds.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I was struck when the gentleman from Florida said, why should we do this at the expense of other people? That's the crux of the disagreement between us. It doesn't come at the expense of other

people. The fact that the largest single linguistic minority gets an ability to do this in their own language, which will, by the way, also probably increase tax collection, so it probably is an offset and it probably makes money for the Federal Government. But the gentleman's phrasing "at the expense of," that's what troubles me. It does not come at my expense if we reach out to hardworking people who have trouble with English.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I yield to our majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I would like to congratulate Mr. SERRANO. This is his first bill that he has brought to the floor and handled, and he has done it very well. I want to thank him.

I also want to congratulate my good friend, RALPH REGULA. I had the great honor of serving for 6 years under his chairmanship of the Labor Health Committee of which I had the honor of serving. He did an outstanding job, he's done a good job with this bill as well. I thank him for facilitating consideration of this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I simply want to say to the leader, I very much appreciate your taking the time to make those expressions. They've done a fabulous job on this bill, and it's an illustration of what can happen when we work so well together.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, at this time, however, I would like to mention a matter. I would have liked to ask for a unanimous consent. I will not ask for that unanimous consent because it has not been agreed to. And under our rules, I therefore am constrained to ask for the unanimous consent.

The Senate passed yesterday, by unanimous consent, without objection, obviously, by definition, the Transition Medical Assistance and Abstinence Education Program. That program is a program which provides for transitional medical assistance for those who transit from welfare to work. It's a very important program. It, unfortunately, expires on June 30. We will not

be here on June 30. This could have been passed, and I would hope would have been passed by unanimous consent. Unfortunately, that has not occurred, and therefore I will not be offering, as I said, such request.

I would say, however, that it will be our intention to offer this as soon as we return the first week that we're back. We believe this is very important to pass. And as a result, we will move it as quickly as we can.

I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. CARDOZA of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. DEFazio of Oregon.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

An amendment by Mr. SOUDER of Indiana.

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE on Barracks Row.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 19 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 22 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL of California regarding Lincoln Commission.

An amendment by Mr. EMANUEL of Illinois.

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL of California regarding earmarks.

An amendment by Mr. WICKER of Mississippi.

An amendment by Mr. PENCE of Indiana.

Amendment No. 31 by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 13 by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. GOODE of Virginia.

An amendment by Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

The Chair would also remind all Members that 2 minutes is going to be strictly adhered to. The Chair would ask Members to remain in the Chamber.

□ 1700

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARDOZA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARDOZA:

Page 65, line 17, insert after the first dollar amount “(reduced by \$8,000,000)”.

Page 65, line 25, insert after the first dollar amount “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 281, noes 144, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 584]

AYES—281

Ackerman	Donnelly	Kucinich
Aderholt	Duncan	Lampson
Allen	Edwards	Langevin
Altmire	Ehlers	Lantos
Andrews	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Arcuri	Ellsworth	Larson (CT)
Baca	Emanuel	LaTourette
Bachus	Emerson	Lee
Baird	Engel	Levin
Baker	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Baldwin	Etheridge	Lipinski
Barrow	Everett	LoBiondo
Bartlett (MD)	Faleomavaega	Loeb
Bean	Farr	Lofgren, Zoe
Becerra	Fattah	Lowey
Berkley	Ferguson	Lynch
Berman	Filner	Mahoney (FL)
Berry	Flake	Maloney (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	Markey
Bishop (NY)	Gerlach	Marshall
Blumenauer	Giffords	Matheson
Bordallo	Gillibrand	Matsui
Boren	Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)
Boswell	Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)
Boucher	Gordon	McCotter
Boyd (FL)	Green, Al	McCrery
Boyda (KS)	Green, Gene	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Brown, Corrine	Hall (NY)	McNerney
Buchanan	Hare	Meehan
Butterfield	Harman	Meek (FL)
Buyer	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Calvert	Heller	Melancon
Capps	Hensarling	Michaud
Capuano	Herseth Sandlin	Miller (MI)
Cardoza	Higgins	Miller, George
Carnahan	Hill	Mitchell
Carney	Hinchey	Mollohan
Carson	Hinojosa	Moore (KS)
Castor	Hirono	Moore (WI)
Chandler	Hobson	Moran (KS)
Christensen	Hodes	Moran (VA)
Clarke	Holden	Murphy (CT)
Clay	Holt	Murphy, Patrick
Cleaver	Honda	Murtha
Clyburn	Hooley	Musgrave
Cohen	Hoyer	Nadler
Conyers	Hunter	Napolitano
Cooper	Inslee	Neal (MA)
Costa	Israel	Norton
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Courtney	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Cramer	(TX)	Obey
Crowley	Jefferson	Olver
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cummings	Johnson (IL)	Pascarella
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Payne
Davis (IL)	Kagen	Perlmutter
Davis, Lincoln	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
DeFazio	Kaptur	Petri
DeGette	Kennedy	Platts
DeLaunt	Kildee	Pomeroy
DeLauro	Kilpatrick	Porter
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kind	Price (NC)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Radanovich
Dingell	Kirk	Rahall
Doggett	Klein (FL)	Ramstad

Rangel	Sestak	Tierney
Renzi	Shays	Towns
Reyes	Shea-Porter	Udall (CO)
Rodriguez	Sherman	Udall (NM)
Rogers (MI)	Shuler	Van Hollen
Ros-Lehtinen	Sires	Velázquez
Ross	Skelton	Visclosky
Rothman	Slaughter	Walz (MN)
Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman
Royce	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Ruppersberger	Snyder	Waters
Rush	Solis	Watson
Ryan (OH)	Space	Watt
Salazar	Spratt	Waxman
Sánchez, Linda	Stark	Weiner
T.	Stearns	Welch (VT)
Sanchez, Loretta	Stupak	Weller
Sarbanes	Sutton	Wexler
Saxton	Tancred	Wilson (OH)
Schakowsky	Tanner	Woolsey
Schiff	Tauscher	Wu
Schwartz	Taylor	Wynn
Scott (GA)	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Young (AK)
Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
Serrano	Tiberi	

NOES—144

Akin	Foxx	Miller, Gary
Alexander	Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Tim
Barrett (SC)	Frelinghuysen	Myrick
Barton (TX)	Gallegly	Neugebauer
Biggart	Garrett (NJ)	Paul
Bilbray	Gilchrest	Pearce
Bilirakis	Gingrey	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Peterson (PA)
Blackburn	Goode	Pickering
Blunt	Goodlatte	Pitts
Boehner	Granger	Poe
Bonner	Graves	Price (GA)
Bono	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Boozman	Hastert	Putnam
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Brady (TX)	Hayes	Rehberg
Brown (SC)	Herger	Reichert
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Ginny	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Camp (MI)	Jindal	Roskam
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	Jordan	Sali
Cantor	Keller	Schmidt
Capito	King (IA)	Shadegg
Carter	King (NY)	Shimkus
Castle	Kline (MN)	Shuster
Chabot	Knollenberg	Simpson
Coble	Kuhl (NY)	Smith (NE)
Cole (OK)	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Latham	Souder
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Sullivan
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Terry
Culberson	Linder	Thornberry
Davis, David	Lucas	Turner
Davis, Tom	Lungren, Daniel	Upton
Deal (GA)	E.	Walberg
Dent	Mack	Walden (OR)
Dicks	Manzullo	Walsh (NY)
Doolittle	Marchant	Wamp
Doyle	McCarthy (CA)	Weldon (FL)
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Westmoreland
Dreier	McHenry	Whitfield
English (PA)	McHugh	Wicker
Fallin	McKeon	Wilson (NM)
Feeney	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Fossella	Miller (NC)	

NOT VOTING—12

□ 1723

Mr. HALL of Texas changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Messrs. McCOTTER, KUCINICH, MITCHELL, BERRY, TIAHRT, DOGGETT, TAYLOR, KINGSTON, RADANOVICH, REYES and ROYCE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to remind Members that the remainder of the votes, which are substantial in number, are going to be 2-minute votes. The Chair entreats Members to please stay in the Chamber. We intend to be strict with regard to the 2 minutes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. DEFAZIO: Page 80, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 81, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 95, noes 320, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 585]

## AYES—95

Arcuri	Honda	Sánchez, Linda
Baldwin	Hooley	T.
Berkley	Jackson-Lee	Schakowsky
Berry	(TX)	Scott (GA)
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Scott (VA)
Bordallo	Johnson (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Braley (IA)	Johnson (IL)	Shays
Camp (MI)	Kildee	Sires
Carney	Kingston	Skelton
Carson	Kucinich	Slaughter
Christensen	Lee	Space
Cohen	Loeb sack	Stark
Conyers	Lofgren, Zoe	Stupak
Costello	McCotter	Sutton
Crowley	McNerney	Tancred o
Davis (IL)	Meehan	Terry
DeFazio	Melancon	Thompson (CA)
Duncan	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Miller, George	Tiberi
Engel	Moore (WI)	Towns
Faleomavaega	Moran (KS)	Upton
Farr	Nadler	Velázquez
Filner	Pallone	Walden (OR)
Frank (MA)	Paul	Walz (MN)
Garrett (NJ)	Payne	Waters
Green, Al	Perlmutter	Welch (VT)
Gutierrez	Petri	Wexler
Hall (NY)	Porter	Wilson (OH)
Hall (TX)	Rangel	Woolsey
Heller	Rohrabacher	Wu
Hinchey	Royce	Wynn
Hodes	Rush	Young (FL)
Holt		

## NOES—320

Ackerman	Berman	Boustany
Aderholt	Biggert	Boyd (FL)
Akin	Bilbray	Boyda (KS)
Alexander	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Brown (SC)
Andrews	Bishop (UT)	Brown, Corrine
Baca	Blackburn	Brown-Waite,
Bachus	Blunt	Ginny
Baird	Boehner	Buchanan
Baker	Bonner	Burgess
Barrett (SC)	Bono	Burton (IN)
Barrow	Boozman	Butterfield
Barton (TX)	Boren	Buyer
Bean	Boswell	Calvert
Becerra	Boucher	Campbell (CA)

Cannon	Holden	Olver
Cantor	Hoyer	Pascrell
Capps	Hulshof	Pastor
Carnahan	Hunter	Pearce
Carter	Inglis (SC)	Pence
Castle	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Castor	Israel	Peterson (PA)
Chabot	Issa	Pickering
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Pitts
Clarke	Jindal	Platts
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Poe
Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	Pomeroy
Coble	Jones (NC)	Price (GA)
Cole (OK)	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)
Conaway	Jordan	Putnam
Cooper	Kagen	Radanovich
Costa	Kanjorski	Rahall
Courtney	Kaptur	Ramstad
Cramer	Keller	Regula
Crenshaw	Kennedy	Rehberg
Cubin	Kilpatrick	Reichert
Cuellar	Kind	Renzi
Culberson	King (IA)	Reyes
Cummings	King (NY)	Reynolds
Davis (AL)	Kirk	Rodriguez
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Rogers (AL)
Davis, David	Kline (MN)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Lincoln	Knollenberg	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Tom	Kuhl (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal (GA)	Lamborn	Roskam
DeGette	Lampson	Ross
DeLauro	Langevin	Rothman
Dent	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart, L.	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Diaz-Balart, M.	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Dicks	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Dingell	LaTourette	Salazar
Doggett	Levin	Sali
Donnelly	Lewis (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Doolittle	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Doyle	Lewis (KY)	Saxton
Drake	Linder	Schiff
Dreier	Lipinski	Schmidt
Edwards	LoBiondo	Schwartz
Ehlers	Lowe y	Serrano
Ellsworth	Lucas	Sestak
Emanuel	Lungren, Daniel	Shadegg
Emerson	E.	Shea-Porter
English (PA)	Lynch	Sherman
Eshoo	Mack	Shimkus
Etheridge	Mahoney (FL)	Shuler
Everett	Maloney (NY)	Shuster
Fallin	Manzullo	Simpson
Fattah	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Feeney	Marshall	Smith (NJ)
Ferguson	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Flake	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Fortenberry	McCarthy (CA)	Snyder
Fossella	McCarthy (NY)	Solis
Fox	McCaul (TX)	Souder
Franks (AZ)	McCollum (MN)	Spratt
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Stearns
Gallely	McDermott	Sullivan
Gerlach	McHenry	Tanner
Giffords	McHugh	Tauscher
Gilchrest	McIntyre	Taylor
Gillibrand	McKeon	Thornberry
Gillmor	McMorris	Tiahrt
Gingrey	Rodgers	Turner
Gohmert	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Goode	Mica	Van Hollen
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Visclosky
Gordon	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Granger	Miller (NC)	Walsh (NY)
Graves	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Green, Gene	Mitchell	Wasserman
Grijalva	Mollohan	Schultz
Hare	Moore (KS)	Watson
Harman	Moran (VA)	Watt
Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Waxman
Hastings (WA)	Murphy, Patrick	Weiner
Hayes	Murphy, Tim	Weldon (FL)
Hensarling	Murtha	Weller
Herger	Musgrave	Westmoreland
Herse th Sandlin	Myrick	Whitfield
Higgins	Napolitano	Wicker
Hill	Neugebauer	Wilson (NM)
Hinojosa	Norton	Wilson (SC)
Hirono	Nunes	Wolf
Hobson	Oberstar	Yarmuth
Hoekstra	Obey	Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—22

Cardoza	Forbes
Clay	Fortuño
Davis (KY)	Hastert
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood
Delahunt	Markey

McGovern	Ortiz	Tierney
McNulty	Pryce (OH)	
Neal (MA)	Sessions	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 1727

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

Strike section 738 (page 117, line 9, through page 124, line 13) and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 268, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 586]

## AYES—158

Aderholt	Everett	McHenry
Akin	Fallin	McKeon
Alexander	Feeney	McMorris
Bachus	Flake	Rodgers
Baker	Fortenberry	Mica
Barrett (SC)	Fossella	Miller (FL)
Bartlett (MD)	Fox	Miller (MI)
Barton (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary
Biggert	Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)
Bilbray	Gallely	Musgrave
Bilirakis	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Blackburn	Gingrey	Neugebauer
Blunt	Gohmert	Nunes
Boehner	Goode	Paul
Bonner	Goodlatte	Pearce
Bono	Granger	Pence
Boozman	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Boustany	Hall (TX)	Petri
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Pickering
Brown (SC)	Hayes	Pitts
Brown-Waite,	Heller	Poe
Ginny	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Burgess	Hoekstra	Putnam
Burton (IN)	Hulshof	Radanovich
Buyer	Inglis (SC)	Ramstad
Calvert	Jindal	Regula
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Rehberg
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Reichert
Cantor	Keller	Renzi
Carter	King (IA)	Reynolds
Coble	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Rohrabacher
Cubin	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Culberson	Kuhl (NY)	Royce
Davis, David	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Tom	Latham	Sali
Deal (GA)	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Dent	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Shays
Doolittle	Mack	Shimkus
Drake	Manzullo	Shuster
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Smith (NE)
Ehlers	McCrery	Smith (TX)

Souder  
Sullivan  
Tancred  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi

Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller

Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Young (FL)

Wolf  
Woolsey  
  
Abercrombie  
Bachmann  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, Jo Ann

Wu  
Wynn  
  
Forbes  
Fortuño  
Hastert  
LaHood

Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
  
McNulty  
Ortiz  
Sessions

McCarthy (CA)  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Mitchell  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (PA)  
Pickering

Pitts  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Radanovich  
Regula  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ryan (WI)  
Saxton  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shinkus  
Shuster  
Simpson

Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Sullivan  
Tancred  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Turner  
Walberg  
Walsh (NY)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOES—268

Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Bordallo  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Cannon  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castle  
Castor  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Christensen  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Faleomavaega  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor

Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Insee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)

Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Norton  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Platts  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skellton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN  
The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).  
One minute remains in the vote.

□ 1732

Mr. STEARNS changed his vote from  
“aye” to “no.”  
Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SALI and  
Ms. FALLIN changed their vote from  
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TOM DAVIS OF  
VIRGINIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM  
DAVIS) on which further proceedings  
were postponed and on which the noes  
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-  
lows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOM DAVIS of  
Virginia:

At the end of the bill add the following new  
section:

## TITLE \_\_\_\_

SEC. \_\_\_\_ the amount otherwise provided  
for under title IV for the Federal Payment  
for Resident Tuition Support is increased by  
\$1,000,000 and the amount otherwise provided  
for Salaries and Expenses of the Office of  
Special Counsel is reduced by \$1,000,000.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has  
been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 146, noes 279,  
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

AYES—146

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boren  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Cannon  
Capito  
Carney  
Castle  
Chabot  
Clay  
Coble

Cole (OK)  
Culberson  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
Eshoo  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Graves

Hall (TX)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hookey  
Hunter  
Issa  
Jindal  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant

McCarthy (CA)  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Mitchell  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (PA)  
Pickering

Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Faleomavaega  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Folmy  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor

Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Platts  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz

## NOES—279

Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boozman  
Bordallo  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cantor  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carson  
Carter  
Castor  
Chandler  
Christensen  
Clarke  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Drake  
Duncan  
Edwards

Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Faleomavaega  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Folmy  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Granger  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Linder  
Loeb sack

Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Platts  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz



Scott (GA)	Stearns	Walz (MN)
Scott (VA)	Stupak	Wasserman
Sensenbrenner	Sutton	Schultz
Serrano	Tanner	Waters
Sestak	Tauscher	Watson
Shea-Porter	Taylor	Watt
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Waxman
Shuler	Thompson (MS)	Weiner
Sires	Tiberi	Welch (VT)
Skelton	Tierney	Westmoreland
Slaughter	Towns	Wexler
Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)	Whitfield
Smith (WA)	Udall (NM)	Wilson (OH)
Snyder	Upton	Woolsey
Solis	Van Hollen	Wu
Space	Velázquez	Wynn
Spatt	Visclosky	Yarmuth
Stark	Walden (OR)	

## NOT VOTING—12

Abercrombie	Fortuño	McNulty
Davis (KY)	Hastert	Norton
Davis, Jo Ann	Hinchey	Ortiz
Forbes	LaHood	Sessions

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).  
One minute remains in the vote.

□ 1738

Mr. ETHERIDGE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members these are 2-minute votes. There are 17 votes that remain. The Chair would encourage and entreat all Members to stay in the Chamber.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

## AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of title VI, insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to enforce the requirements of section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act with respect to non-accelerated filers, who, pursuant to section 210.2-02T of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, are not required to comply with such section 404 prior to December 15, 2007.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 154, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

AYES—267

Aderholt	Arcuri	Barrett (SC)
Akin	Bachmann	Barrow
Alexander	Bachus	Bartlett (MD)
Allen	Baird	Barton (TX)
Andrews	Baker	Bean

Berkley	Granger	Pickering	Delahunt	Kanjorski	Payne
Biggert	Graves	Pitts	DeLauro	Kennedy	Pomeroy
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Platts	Dicks	Kildee	Price (NC)
Bilirakis	Hare	Poe	Dingell	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Porter	Doggett	Klein (FL)	Rothman
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Price (GA)	Doyle	Kucinich	Royal-Allard
Blackburn	Heller	Pryce (OH)	Ellison	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Blunt	Hensarling	Putnam	Ellsworth	Lantos	Salazar
Boehner	Herger	Radanovich	Engel	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Bonner	Hereth Sandlin	Rahall	Eshoo	Lee	T.
Bono	Hill	Ramstad	Etheridge	Levin	Sarbanes
Boozman	Hobson	Regula	Faleomavaega	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Boren	Hoekstra	Rehberg	Farr	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Boswell	Hulshof	Reichert	Fattah	Lowey	Schwartz
Boucher	Hunter	Renzi	Filner	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Boustany	Inglis (SC)	Reyes	Frank (MA)	Maloney (NY)	Serrano
Boyd (FL)	Issa	Reynolds	Gonzalez	Matsui	Shea-Porter
Boyd (KS)	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez	Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Brady (TX)	(TX)	Rogers (AL)	Green, Gene	McCollum (MN)	Sires
Braley (IA)	Jefferson	Rogers (KY)	Grijalva	McDermott	Snyder
Brown (SC)	Jindal	Rogers (MI)	Gutierrez	McGovern	Solis
Brown-Waite,	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher	Hall (NY)	McNerney	Stark
Ginny	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Harman	Meehan	Tauscher
Buchanan	Jones (NC)	Roskam	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Taylor
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Ross	Higgins	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Buyer	Keller	Royce	Hinchey	Miller (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Calvert	Kind	Ruppersberger	Hinojosa	Miller, George	Tierney
Camp (MI)	King (IA)	Rush	Hirono	Mollohan	Towns
Campbell (CA)	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Hodes	Moore (KS)	Udall (NM)
Cannon	Kingston	Sali	Holden	Moore (WI)	Van Hollen
Cantor	Kirk	Sanchez, Loretta	Holt	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Capito	Kline (MN)	Saxton	Honda	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman
Cardoza	Knollenberg	Schmidt	Hooley	Murtha	Schultz
Carney	Kuhl (NY)	Scott (GA)	Hoyer	Nadler	Waters
Carter	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner	Inslee	Napolitano	Watson
Castle	Lampson	Shuler	Israel	Neal (MA)	Watt
Chabot	Larsen (WA)	Shuster	Jackson (IL)	Obey	Waxman
Coble	Latham	Simpson	Johnson (GA)	Oliver	Weiner
Cohen	LaTourette	Skelton	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Wexler
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter	Jones (OH)	Pascrell	Woolsey
Cooper	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)	Kagen	Pastor	Wynn
Costa	Linder	Smith (NJ)			
Cramer	Lipinski	Smith (TX)			
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)			
Cubin	Loebbeck	Souder			
Cuellar	Lucas	Space			
Culberson	Lucas	Spratt			
Davis (AL)	E.	Stearns			
Davis, David	Mack	Stupak			
Davis, Lincoln	Mahoney (FL)	Sullivan			
Davis, Tom	Manzullo	Sutton			
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Tancredo			
Dent	Marshall	Tanner			
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matheson	Terry			
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry			
Donnelly	McCaul (TX)	Tiahrt			
Doolittle	McCotter	Turner			
Drake	McCrery	Udall (CO)			
Dreier	McHenry	Upton			
Duncan	McHugh	Velázquez			
Edwards	McIntyre	Walberg			
Ehlers	McKeon	Walden (OR)			
Emerson	McMorris	Walsh (NY)			
English (PA)	Rodgers	Walz (MN)			
Everett	Melancon	Wamp			
Fallin	Mica	Welch (VT)			
Feeney	Michaud	Weldon (FL)			
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Weller			
Flake	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland			
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Whitfield			
Fossella	Mitchell	Wicker			
Fox	Moran (KS)	Wilson (NM)			
Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Patrick	Wilson (OH)			
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (SC)			
Gallely	Musgrave	Wolf			
Garrett (NJ)	Myrick	Wu			
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Yarmuth			
Giffords	Nunes	Young (AK)			
Gilchrest	Oberstar	Young (FL)			
Gillibrand	Paul				
Gillmor	Pearce				
Gingrey	Pence				
Gohmert	Perlmutter				
Goode	Peterson (MN)				
Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)				
Gordon	Petri				

## NOES—154

Ackerman	Brown, Corrine
Altmire	Butterfield
Baca	Capps
Baldwin	Capuano
Becerra	Carnahan
Berman	Carson
Berry	Castor
Bishop (NY)	Chandler
Blumenauer	Christensen
Bordallo	Clarke
Brady (PA)	Clay

Cleaver
Conaway
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette

## NOT VOTING—16

Abercrombie	Forbes	McNulty
Burgess	Fortuño	Norton
Clyburn	Hastert	Ortiz
Davis (KY)	Kaptur	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	
Emanuel	Markey	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).  
One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1741

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOUDER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

## TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act (including funds made available in title IV or VIII) may be used by the District of Columbia for any program of distributing sterile needles or syringes for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 216, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 589]

#### AYES—208

Aderholt	Fox	Pence
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Peterson (MN)
Alexander	Gallely	Peterson (PA)
Altmire	Garrett (NJ)	Petri
Bachmann	Gerlach	Pickering
Bachus	Gillmor	Pitts
Baker	Gingrey	Platts
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Poe
Barrow	Goode	Pomeroy
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Porter
Barton (TX)	Granger	Price (GA)
Biggert	Graves	Putnam
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Rahall
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Ramstad
Blackburn	Heller	Rehberg
Blunt	Hensarling	Reichert
Boehner	Herger	Renzi
Bonner	Hereth Sandlin	Reynolds
Bono	Hoekstra	Rodriguez
Boozman	Holden	Rogers (AL)
Boren	Hulshof	Rogers (KY)
Boswell	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Boustany	Inglis (SC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	Jindal	Roskam
Brown (SC)	Johnson (IL)	Ross
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Ginny	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Buchanan	Jordan	Sali
Burgess	Keller	Saxton
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Schmidt
Buyer	King (NY)	Scott (GA)
Calvert	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Camp (MI)	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Campbell (CA)	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Cannon	Kuhl (NY)	Shuler
Cantor	Lamborn	Shuster
Capito	Lampson	Simpson
Carney	Latham	Skelton
Carter	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Linder	Smith (NJ)
Chandler	Lipinski	Smith (TX)
Coble	LoBiondo	Souder
Cole (OK)	Lucas	Stearns
Conaway	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Costello	E.	Tancred
Crenshaw	Mack	Tanner
Cubin	Mahoney (FL)	Taylor
Culberson	Manzullo	Terry
Davis (AL)	Marchant	Thornberry
Davis, David	Marshall	Tiahrt
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Dent	McCaul (TX)	Turner
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCotter	Upton
Diaz-Balart, M.	McHenry	Walberg
Donnelly	McHugh	Walden (OR)
Doolittle	McIntyre	Walsh (NY)
Drake	McKeon	Wamp
Dreier	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Duncan	Rodgers	Weller
Ellsworth	Melancon	Westmoreland
Emerson	Mica	Whitfield
English (PA)	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Etheridge	Miller (MI)	Wilson (NM)
Everett	Miller, Gary	Wilson (OH)
Fallin	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Feeney	Murphy, Tim	Wolf
Ferguson	Musgrave	Young (AK)
Flake	Myrick	Young (FL)
Fortenberry	Neugebauer	
Fossella	Pearce	

#### NOES—216

Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Courtney
Allen	Brown, Corrine	Cramer
Andrews	Butterfield	Crowley
Arcuri	Capps	Cuellar
Baca	Capuano	Cummings
Baird	Cardoza	Davis (CA)
Baldwin	Carnahan	Davis (IL)
Bean	Carson	Davis, Lincoln
Becerra	Castle	Davis, Tom
Berkley	Castor	DeFazio
Berman	Christensen	DeGette
Berry	Clarke	Delahunt
Bishop (GA)	Clay	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver	Dicks
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Dingell
Bordallo	Cohen	Doggett
Boucher	Conyers	Doyle
Boyd (FL)	Cooper	Edwards
Boyd (KS)	Costa	Ehlers

Ellison	Langevin	Reyes
Emanuel	Lantos	Rohrabacher
Engel	Larsen (WA)	Rothman
Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Faleomavaega	LaTourette	Ruppersberger
Farr	Lee	Rush
Fattah	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Filner	Lewis (CA)	Salazar
Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Linda
Frelinghuysen	Loeb	T.
Giffords	Lofgren, Zoe	Sanchez, Loretta
Gilchrest	Lowe	Sarbanes
Gillibrand	Lynch	Schakowsky
Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)	Schiff
Gordon	Markey	Schwartz
Green, Al	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Green, Gene	Matsui	Serrano
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Sestak
Gutierrez	McCollum (MN)	Shays
Hall (NY)	McDermott	Shea-Porter
Hare	McGovern	Sherman
Harman	McNerney	Sires
Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Slaughter
Higgins	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hill	Meeks (NY)	Snyder
Hinchey	Michaud	Solis
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Space
Hirono	Miller, George	Stark
Hobson	Mitchell	Stupak
Hodes	Mollohan	Sutton
Holt	Moore (KS)	Tauscher
Honda	Moore (WI)	Thompson (CA)
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Tierney
Inslee	Murphy, Patrick	Towns
Israel	Murtha	Udall (CO)
Issa	Nadler	Udall (NM)
Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Van Hollen
Jackson-Lee	Neal (MA)	Velazquez
(TX)	Norton	Vislosky
Jefferson	Oberstar	Walz (MN)
Johnson (GA)	Obey	Wasserman
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Schultz
Jones (OH)	Pallone	Waters
Kagen	Pascarella	Watson
Kanjorski	Pastor	Watt
Kaptur	Paul	Waxman
Kennedy	Payne	Weiner
Kildee	Pelosi	Welch (VT)
Kilpatrick	Perlmutter	Wexler
Kind	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Kirk	Pryce (OH)	Wu
Klein (FL)	Rangel	Wynn
Kucinich	Regula	Yarmuth

#### NOT VOTING—14

Abercrombie	Fortuño	Nunes
Braley (IA)	Hastert	Ortiz
Davis (KY)	LaHood	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	McCrery	Spratt
Forbes	McNulty	

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).  
One minute remains in the vote.

□ 1745

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 335, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]

#### AYES—87

Akin	Gingrey	Pearce
Bachmann	Gohmert	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Petri
Barton (TX)	Graves	Pitts
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Bilbray	Heller	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Putnam
Blackburn	Herger	Radanovich
Boehner	Inglis (SC)	Ramstad
Brown (SC)	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Buyer	Jordan	Royce
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Sali
Cannon	Kline (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Lamborn	Schmidt
Castle	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Lungren, Daniel	Shadegg
Coble	E.	Shimkus
Conaway	Mack	Smith (NE)
Cooper	Marchant	Souder
Davis, David	McCarthy (CA)	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	McCaul (TX)	Tancred
Duncan	McHenry	Terry
Ehlers	Mica	Thornberry
Feeney	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Flake	Miller, Gary	Musgrave
Fossella		Myrick
Franks (AZ)		Nunes
Garrett (NJ)		

#### NOES—335

Ackerman	Courtney	Hare
Aderholt	Cramer	Harman
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Crowley	Hayes
Altmire	Cubin	Hereth Sandlin
Andrews	Cuellar	Higgins
Arcuri	Culberson	Hill
Baca	Cummings	Hinchey
Bachus	Davis (AL)	Hinojosa
Baird	Davis (CA)	Hirono
Baker	Davis (IL)	Hobson
Baldwin	Davis, Lincoln	Hodes
Barrow	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Bartlett (MD)	DeFazio	Holden
Bean	DeGette	Holt
Becerra	Delahunt	Honda
Berkley	DeLauro	Hooley
Berman	Dent	Hoyer
Berry	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hulshof
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hunter
Bishop (GA)	Dicks	Inslee
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Israel
Blumenauer	Doggett	Issa
Blunt	Donnelly	Jackson (IL)
Bonner	Doolittle	Jackson-Lee
Bono	Doyle	(TX)
Boozman	Drake	Jefferson
Bordallo	Dreier	Johnson (GA)
Boren	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Boswell	Ellison	Jones (NC)
Boucher	Ellsworth	Jones (OH)
Boustany	Emanuel	Kagen
Boyd (FL)	Emerson	Kanjorski
Boyda (KS)	Engel	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	English (PA)	Keller
Brady (TX)	Eshoo	Kennedy
Braley (IA)	Etheridge	Kildee
Brown, Corrine	Everett	Kilpatrick
Brown-Waite,	Faleomavaega	Kind
Ginny	Fallin	King (NY)
Burgess	Farr	Kingston
Butterfield	Fattah	Kirk
Calvert	Ferguson	Klein (FL)
Camp (MI)	Filner	Knollenberg
Capito	Fortenberry	Kucinich
Capps	Fox	Kuhl (NY)
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Cardoza	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Carnahan	Gallely	Lantos
Carney	Gerlach	Larsen (WA)
Carson	Giffords	Larson (CT)
Carter	Gilchrest	Latham
Castor	Gillibrand	LaTourette
Chandler	Gillmor	Lee
Christensen	Gonzalez	Levin
Clarke	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Clay	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Cleaver	Granger	Lewis (KY)
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lipinski
Cohen	Green, Gene	LoBiondo
Cole (OK)	Grijalva	Loeb
Conyers	Gutierrez	Lofgren, Zoe
Costa	Hall (NY)	Lowe
Costello	Hall (TX)	Lucas

Lynch	Peterson (PA)	Snyder	[Roll No. 591]	McCrery	Ramstad	Space
Mahoney (FL)	Pickering	Solis		McDermott	Rangel	Spratt
Maloney (NY)	Platts	Space	AYES—60	McGovern	Regula	Stark
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Spratt		McHenry	Rehberg	Stupak
Markey	Porter	Stark		McHugh	Reichert	Sutton
Marshall	Price (NC)	Stearns		McIntyre	Renzi	Tancred
Matheson	Pryce (OH)	Stupak		McKeon	Reyes	Tanner
Matsui	Rahall	Sutton		McMorris	Reynolds	Tauscher
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Tanner		Rodgers	Rodriguez	Taylor
McCollum (MN)	Regula	Tauscher		McNerney	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
McCotter	Rehberg	Taylor		Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
McDermott	Reichert	Thompson (CA)		Meek (FL)	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
McGovern	Renzi	Thompson (MS)		Meeks (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
McHugh	Reyes	Tiahrt		Melancon	Roskam	Tierney
McIntyre	Reynolds	Tiberi		Michaud	Ross	Towns
McKeon	Rodriguez	Towns		Miller (MI)	Rothman	Turner
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Turner		Miller (NC)	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Udall (CO)		Miller, Gary	Royce	Udall (NM)
McNerney	Ros-Lehtinen	Udall (NM)		Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Upton
Meehan	Ross	Upton		Mitchell	Rush	Van Hollen
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Van Hollen		Mollohan	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
Melancon	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez		Moore (KS)	Salazar	Walden (OR)
Michaud	Ruppersberger	Visclosky		Moore (WI)	Sánchez, Linda	Walsh (NY)
Miller (MI)	Rush	Walden (OR)		Moran (KS)	T.	Walsh (NY)
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Walsh (NY)	NOES—361	Moran (VA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz (MN)
Mitchell	Salazar	Walsh (MN)		Murphy (CT)	Sarbanes	Wamp
Mollohan	Sánchez, Linda	Wamp		Murphy, Patrick	Saxton	Wasserman
Moore (KS)	T.	Wasserman		Murphy, Tim	Schakowsky	Schultz
Moore (WI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Schultz		Murtha	Schiff	Waters
Moran (KS)	Sarbanes	Watson		Nadler	Schwartz	Watson
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Watt		Napolitano	Scott (GA)	Watt
Murphy (CT)	Schakowsky	Weiner		Nunes	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Murphy, Patrick	Schiff	Wexler		Oberstar	Serrano	Weiner
Murphy, Tim	Schwartz	Whitfield		Obey	Sestak	Welch (VT)
Murtha	Scott (GA)	Wicker		Olver	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Wilson (NM)		Pallone	Shea-Porter	Weller
Napolitano	Serrano	Wilson (OH)		Pascarell	Sherman	Wexler
Neal (MA)	Sestak	Wolf		Pastor	Shimkus	Whitfield
Neugebauer	Shays	Woolsey		Paul	Shuler	Wicker
Norton	Shea-Porter	Wu		Payne	Shuster	Wilson (NM)
Oberstar	Sherman	Wynn		Perlmutter	Simpson	Wilson (OH)
Obey	Shuler	Yarmuth		Olver	Sires	Wolf
Pallone	Shuster	Young (AK)		Pascarell	Skelton	Woolsey
Pascarell	Simpson	Young (FL)		Pastor	Slaughter	Wu
Pastor	Sires			Paul	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Payne	Skelton			Perlmutter	Smith (TX)	Yarmuth
Peterson (MN)	Smith (TX)			Peterson (MN)	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
	Smith (WA)			Rahall	Solis	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie	Hastert	Miller, George
Davis (KY)	LaHood	Ortiz
Davis, Jo Ann	McCrery	Sessions
Forbes	McNulty	Tierney
Fortuño	Meek (FL)	Waters

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members have 1 minute to record their vote.

□ 1748

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding Barracks Row on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 60, noes 361, not voting 16, as follows:

Bachmann	Gingrey	Platts
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Poe
Bilbray	Graves	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Heller	Putnam
Buchanan	Hensarling	Radanovich
Burgess	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Sali
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Coble	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Linder	Shadegg
Cooper	Mica	Smith (NE)
Davis, David	Miller (FL)	Souder
Deal (GA)	Musgrave	Stearns
Duncan	Myrick	Sullivan
Feeney	Neugebauer	Terry
Flake	Pearce	Thornberry
Fossella	Pence	Walberg
Franks (AZ)	Petri	Westmoreland
Garrett (NJ)	Pitts	Wilson (SC)
Ackerman	Crenshaw	Hirono
Aderholt	Crowley	Hobson
Akin	Cubin	Hodes
Alexander	Cuellar	Hoekstra
Allen	Culberson	Holden
Altmire	Cummings	Holt
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Honda
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Hookey
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hoyer
Baird	Davis, Lincoln	Hulshof
Baker	Davis, Tom	Hunter
Baldwin	DeFazio	Inslee
Barrow	DeGette	Israel
Bartlett (MD)	Delahunt	Issa
Barton (TX)	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Bean	Dent	Jackson-Lee
Becerra	Diaz-Balart, L.	(TX)
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jefferson
Berman	Dicks	Johnson (GA)
Berry	Dingell	Johnson (IL)
Biggert	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Bilirakis	Donnelly	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (GA)	Doolittle	Jones (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Drake	Kagen
Blumenauer	Dreier	Kanjorski
Blunt	Edwards	Kaptur
Boehner	Ehlers	Keller
Bonner	Ellison	Kennedy
Bono	Ellsworth	Kildee
Boozman	Emanuel	Kilpatrick
Bordallo	Emerson	Kind
Boren	Engel	King (NY)
Boswell	English (PA)	Kingston
Boucher	Eshoo	Kirk
Boustany	Etheridge	Klein (FL)
Boyd (FL)	Everett	Knollenberg
Boyda (KS)	Faleomavaega	Kucinich
Brady (PA)	Fallin	Kuhl (NY)
Brady (TX)	Farr	Lampson
Braley (IA)	Fattah	Langevin
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	Lantos
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Larsen (WA)
Brown-Waite,	Fortenberry	Larson (CT)
Ginny	Fox	Latham
Butterfield	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Lee
Calvert	Gallegly	Levin
Camp (MI)	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Cannon	Giffords	Lewis (GA)
Cantor	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Capito	Gillibrand	Lipinski
Capps	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Capuano	Gohmert	Loeb
Cardoza	Gonzalez	Lofgren, Zoe
Carnahan	Goode	Lowe
Carney	Gordon	Lucas
Carson	Granger	Lungren, Daniel
Carter	Green, Al	E.
Castle	Green, Gene	Lynch
Castor	Grijalva	Mack
Chandler	Gutierrez	Mahoney (FL)
Christensen	Hall (NY)	Maloney (NY)
Clarke	Hall (TX)	Manzullo
Clay	Hare	Marchant
Cleaver	Harman	Markey
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Marshall
Cohen	Hastings (WA)	Matheson
Cole (OK)	Hayes	Matsui
Conyers	Herger	McCarthy (CA)
Costa	Herseth Sandlin	McCarthy (NY)
Costello	Higgins	McCaul (TX)
Courtney	Hill	McCollum (MN)
Cramer	Hinchey	McCotter

## NOT VOTING—16

Abercrombie	Hastert	Norton
Bachus	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Davis (KY)	King (IA)	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Visclosky
Forbes	McNulty	
Fortuño	Neal (MA)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in the vote.

□ 1751

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 102, noes 317, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]

## AYES—102

Akin Franks (AZ) Neugebauer  
 Bachmann Garrett (NJ) Nunes  
 Barrett (SC) Gingrey Pearce  
 Barton (TX) Gohmert Pence  
 Biggert Goodlatte Petri  
 Bilbray Graves Pitts  
 Bishop (UT) Gutierrez Platts  
 Blackburn Hall (TX) Poe  
 Boehner Hastings (WA) Price (GA)  
 Brady (TX) Heller Putnam  
 Brown-Waite, Hensarling Radanovich  
 Ginny Inglis (SC) Rogers (MI)  
 Buchanan Issa Rohrabacher  
 Burgess Jindal Roskam  
 Burton (IN) Johnson (IL) Royce  
 Buyer Johnson, Sam Ryan (WI)  
 Camp (MI) Jordan Sali  
 Campbell (CA) King (IA) Schmidt  
 Cannon Kingston Sensenbrenner  
 Cantor Kirk Shadegg  
 Castle Kline (MN) Shimkus  
 Chabot Lamborn Smith (NE)  
 Coble Linder Souder  
 Conaway Lungren, Daniel Stearns  
 Cooper E. Sullivan  
 Davis, David Mack Tancredo  
 Davis, Tom Marchant Terry  
 Deal (GA) McCarthy (CA) Thornberry  
 Delahunt McCaul (TX) Upton  
 Duncan McHenry Walberg  
 Ehlers Mica Miller (FL) Westmoreland  
 Feeney Miller, Gary Wilson (SC)  
 Flake Musgrave Young (AK)  
 Fossella Myrick

## NOES—317

Ackerman Costello Hare  
 Aderholt Courtney Harman  
 Alexander Cramer Hastings (FL)  
 Allen Crenshaw Hayes  
 Altmire Crowley Herseth Sandlin  
 Andrews Cubin Higgins  
 Arcuri Cuellar Hill  
 Baca Culberson Hinchey  
 Bachus Cummings Hirono  
 Baird Davis (AL) Hobson  
 Baker Davis (CA) Hodes  
 Baldwin Davis (IL) Holden  
 Barrow Davis, Lincoln Holt  
 Bartlett (MD) DeFazio Honda  
 Bean DeGette Hooley  
 Becerra DeLauro Hoyer  
 Berkley Dent Hulshof  
 Berman Diaz-Balart, L. Hunter  
 Berry Diaz-Balart, M. Inslee  
 Bilirakis Dicks Israel  
 Bishop (GA) Dingell Jackson (IL)  
 Bishop (NY) Donnelly Jackson-Lee  
 Blumenauer Doolittle (TX)  
 Blunt Doyle Jefferson  
 Bonner Drake Johnson (GA)  
 Bono Dreier Johnson, E. B.  
 Boozman Edwards Jones (NC)  
 Bordallo Ellison Kagen  
 Boren Ellsworth Kanjorski  
 Boswell Emanuel Kaptur  
 Boucher Emerson Keller  
 Boustany Engel Kennedy  
 Boyd (FL) English (PA) Kildee  
 Boyda (KS) Eshoo Kilpatrick  
 Brady (PA) Etheridge Kind  
 Braley (IA) Everett King (NY)  
 Brown (SC) Faleomavaega Klein (FL)  
 Brown, Corrine Fallin Knollenberg  
 Butterfield Farr Kucinich  
 Calvert Fattah Kuhl (NY)  
 Capito Ferguson Lampson  
 Capps Filner Langevin  
 Capuano Fortenberry Lantos  
 Cardoza Frank (MA) Larsen (WA)  
 Carnahan Frelinghuysen Larson (CT)  
 Carney Gallegly Latham  
 Carson Gerlach LaTourette  
 Carter Giffords Levin  
 Castor Gilchrest Lewis (CA)  
 Chandler Gillibrand Lewis (GA)  
 Christensen Gillmor Lewis (KY)  
 Clarke Gonzalez Lipinski  
 Clay Goode LoBiondo  
 Cleaver Gordon Loeb sack  
 Clyburn Granger Lofgren, Zoe  
 Cohen Green, Al Lowey  
 Cole (OK) Green, Gene Lucas  
 Conyers Grijalva Lynch  
 Costa Hall (NY) Mahoney (FL)

Maloney (NY) Peterson (MN) Smith (WA)  
 Manzullo Peterson (PA) Snyder  
 Markey Pickering Solis  
 Marshall Pomeroy Space  
 Matheson Porter Spratt  
 Matsui Price (NC) Stark  
 McCarthy (NY) Pryce (OH) Stupak  
 McCollum (MN) Rahall Sutton  
 McCotter Rangel Tanner  
 McCrery Regula Tauscher  
 McDermott Rehberg Taylor  
 McGovern Reichert Thompson (CA)  
 McHugh Renzi Thompson (MS)  
 McIntyre Reyes Tiahrt  
 McKeon Reynolds Tiberi  
 McMorris Rodriguez Tierney  
 Rodgers Rogers (AL) Towns  
 McNeerney Rogers (KY) Turner  
 Meehan Ros-Lehtinen Udall (CO)  
 Meek (FL) Ross Udall (NM)  
 Meeks (NY) Rothman Van Hollen  
 Melancon Roybal-Allard Velázquez  
 Michaud Ruppertsberger Visclosky  
 Miller (MI) Ryan (OH) Walden (OR)  
 Miller (NC) Salazar Walsh (NY)  
 Miller, George Sánchez, Linda Walz (MN)  
 Mitchell T. Wamp  
 Mollohan Sanchez, Loretta Wasserman  
 Moore (KS) Sarbanes Schultz  
 Moore (WI) Saxton Waters  
 Moran (KS) Schakowsky Watson  
 Moran (VA) Schiff Watt  
 Murphy (CT) Schwartz Waxman  
 Murphy, Patrick Scott (GA) Weiner  
 Murphy, Tim Scott (VA) Welch (VT)  
 Murtha Serrano Weldon (FL)  
 Napolitano Sestak Weller  
 Neal (MA) Shays Wexler  
 Norton Shea-Porter Whitfield  
 Oberstar Sherman Wicker  
 Obey Shuler Wilson (NM)  
 Oliver Shuster Wilson (OH)  
 Pallone Simpson Wolf  
 Pascrell Sires Woolsey  
 Pastor Skelton Wu  
 Paul Slaughtier Wynn  
 Payne Smith (NJ) Yarmuth  
 Perlmutter Smith (TX) Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—18

Abercrombie Hastert Lee  
 Davis (KY) Herger McNulty  
 Davis, Jo Ann Hinojosa Nadler  
 Doggett Hoekstra Ortiz  
 Forbes Jones (OH) Rush  
 Fortuño LaHood Sessions

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute left in this vote.

□ 1754

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 174, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

## AYES—249

Ackerman Giffords Musgrave  
 Akin Gillibrand Myrick  
 Allen Goodlatte Nadler  
 Bachmann Gordon Neal (MA)  
 Baird Graves Neugebauer  
 Barrett (SC) Green, Al Nunes  
 Barrow Gutierrez Oberstar  
 Barton (TX) Hare Pearce  
 Bean Harman Pence  
 Berkley Hastings (WA) Perlmutter  
 Berman Hayes Petri  
 Berry Heller Pitts  
 Biggert Hensarling Platts  
 Bishop (GA) Herseth Sandlin Poe  
 Blackburn Higgins Pomeroy  
 Blumenauer Hill Porter  
 Boehner Holden Price (GA)  
 Boren Honda Rahall  
 Boswell Hooley Ramstad  
 Boyd (FL) Hoyer Rodriguez  
 Brady (PA) Ingalls (SC) Rogers (MI)  
 Braley (IA) Issa Rohrabacher  
 Brown, Corrine Jackson-Lee Ross  
 Brown-Waite, (TX) Rothman  
 Ginny Jefferson Royce  
 Buchanan Jindal  
 Burgess Johnson (GA) Rush  
 Burton (IN) Johnson (IL) Ryan (WI)  
 Buyer Johnson, E. B. Salazar  
 Camp (MI) Jones (OH) Sali  
 Campbell (CA) Jordan Sánchez, Linda  
 Cannon Kanjorski T.  
 Capps Kilpatrick Sanchez, Loretta  
 Cardoza Kind Saxton  
 Carnahan King (IA) Schakowsky  
 Carney King (NY) Schiff  
 Castle Kingston Schmidt  
 Castor Kirk Schwartz  
 Chabot Klein (FL) Scott (GA)  
 Chandler Kline (MN) Scott (VA)  
 Clarke Lamborn Sensenbrenner  
 Clay Langevin Sestak  
 Cleaver Lantos Shadegg  
 Clyburn Larsen (WA) Shea-Porter  
 Coble Larson (CT) Shimkus  
 Cohen Latham Shires  
 Conaway LaTourette Skelton  
 Cooper Lee Slaughter  
 Costa Lewis (GA) Smith (NE)  
 Courtney Linder Smith (WA)  
 Crowley LoBiondo Solis  
 Cuellar Loeb sack Souder  
 Cummings Lofgren, Zoe Space  
 Davis (AL) Lowey Spratt  
 Davis (CA) Lungren, Daniel Stark  
 Davis (IL) E. Stearns  
 Davis, Lincoln Lynch Stupak  
 Deal (GA) Mack Sullivan  
 DeFazio Mahoney (FL) Sutton  
 DeGette Maloney (NY) Tancredo  
 Delahunt Manzullo Tanner  
 Dent Marchant Tauscher  
 Dicks Markey Terry  
 Dingell Marshall Thompson (CA)  
 Doggett Matheson Thornberry  
 Doyle Matsui Tierney  
 Duncan McCarthy (CA) Turner  
 Ehlers McCarthy (NY) Udall (CO)  
 Ellison McCaul (TX) Upton  
 Emanuel McDermott Walberg  
 Engel McHugh Walden (OR)  
 English (PA) McNeerney Wamp  
 Eshoo Farr Meek (FL)  
 Farr Fattah Meeks (NY)  
 Fattah Feeney Melancon  
 Ferguson Filner Miller (FL)  
 Flake Filner Miller (MI)  
 Fortenberry Miller (NC)  
 Fossella Miller, George Wilson (NM)  
 Frank (MA) Moore (KS) Wilson (SC)  
 Franks (AZ) Moore (WI) Woolsey  
 Garrett (NJ) Moran (VA) Wu  
 Gerlach Murphy, Patrick Yarmuth

## NOES—174

Bartlett (MD) Boozman  
 Alexander Bordallo  
 Becerra Boucher  
 Bilbray Boustany  
 Bilirakis Boyd (KS)  
 Bishop (NY) Brady (TX)  
 Bishop (UT) Brown (SC)  
 Blunt Butterfield  
 Bonner Calvert  
 Bono

Cantor	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Capito	Inslee	Putnam
Capuano	Israel	Radanovich
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Cole (OK)	Jones (NC)	Rehberg
Conyers	Kagen	Reichert
Costello	Kaptur	Renzi
Cramer	Keller	Reynolds
Crenshaw	Kennedy	Rogers (AL)
Cubin	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Culberson	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Tom	Kucinich	Roskam
DeLauro	Kuhl (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lampson	Ruppersberger
Diaz-Balart, M.	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Donnelly	Lewis (CA)	Sarbanes
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Serrano
Drake	Lipinski	Shays
Dreier	Lucas	Sherman
Edwards	McCollum (MN)	Shuler
Ellsworth	McCotter	Shuster
Emerson	McCrery	Simpson
Etheridge	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Everett	McIntyre	Smith (TX)
Faleomavaega	McKeon	Snyder
Fallin	McMorris	Thompson (MS)
Foxx	Rodgers	Tiahrt
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Tiberi
Gallely	Michaud	Towns
Gilchrest	Miller, Gary	Udall (NM)
Gillmor	Mitchell	Van Hollen
Gingrey	Mollohan	Velázquez
Gohmert	Moran (KS)	Visclosky
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	Walsh (NY)
Goode	Murphy, Tim	Walsh (MN)
Granger	Murtha	Wamp
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Wasserman
Grijalva	Norton	Schultz
Hall (NY)	Obey	Watson
Hall (TX)	Oliver	Watt
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Welch (VT)
Herger	Pascarell	Weldon (FL)
Hinchey	Pastor	Weller
Hirono	Paul	Whitfield
Hobson	Payne	Wicker
Hodes	Peterson (MN)	Wilson (OH)
Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Wolf
Holt	Pickering	Young (AK)
Hulshof	Price (NC)	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—14

Abercrombie	Forbes	McNulty
Christensen	Fortuño	Ortiz
Davis (KY)	Hastert	Reyes
Davis, David	Hinojosa	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	

□ 1758

Mr. MARKEY, Mr. POMEROY and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 101, noes 325, not voting 11, as follows:

Akin	Eshoo	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Feeney	Nunes
Barrett (SC)	Flake	Pearce
Barton (TX)	Fossella	Pence
Biggert	Franks (AZ)	Petri
Bilbray	Garrett (NJ)	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Platts
Blackburn	Gingrey	Poe
Blunt	Gohmert	Porter
Boehner	Granger	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Graves	Putnam
Brown (SC)	Heller	Radanovich
Brown-Waite,	Hensarling	Ramstad
Ginny	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jindal	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Royce	Royce
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	Jordan	Sali
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Schmidt
Cannon	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Kirk	Shadegg
Carter	Kline (MN)	Shimkus
Castle	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Linder	Souder
Coble	Mack	Stearns
Conaway	Marchant	Sullivan
Cooper	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Davis, David	McCaul (TX)	Thornberry
Davis, Tom	McHenry	Upton
Deal (GA)	Mica	Walberg
Dent	Miller (FL)	Walden (OR)
Duncan	Musgrave	Westmoreland
Ehlers	Myrick	Wilson (SC)

## NOES—325

Ackerman	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Aderholt	Cubin	Hayes
Alexander	Cuellar	Herger
Allen	Culberson	Herseth Sandlin
Altmire	Cummings	Higgins
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Hill
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Hinchey
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hirono
Bachus	Davis, Lincoln	Hobson
Baird	DeFazio	Hodes
Baker	DeGette	Hoekstra
Baldwin	Delahunt	Holden
Barrow	DeLauro	Holt
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Honda
Bean	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hooley
Becerra	Dicks	Hoyer
Berkley	Dingell	Hulshof
Berman	Doggett	Hunter
Berry	Donnelly	Inslee
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Israel
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Drake	Jackson-Lee
Blumenauer	Dreier	(TX)
Bonner	Edwards	Jefferson
Bono	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Boozman	Ellsworth	Johnson, E. B.
Bordallo	Emanuel	Jones (NC)
Boren	Emerson	Jones (OH)
Boswell	Engel	Kagen
Boucher	English (PA)	Kanjorski
Boustany	Etheridge	Kaptur
Boyd (FL)	Everett	Keller
Boyda (KS)	Faleomavaega	Kennedy
Brady (PA)	Fallin	Kildee
Braley (IA)	Farr	Kilpatrick
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Kind
Butterfield	Ferguson	King (NY)
Calvert	Filner	Klein (FL)
Capito	Fortenberry	Knollenberg
Capps	Foxx	Kucinich
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Kuhl (NY)
Cardoza	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Carnahan	Gallely	Langevin
Carney	Giffords	Lantos
Carson	Gilchrest	Larsen (WA)
Castor	Gillibrand	Larson (CT)
Chandler	Gillmor	Latham
Christensen	Gonzalez	LaTourette
Clarke	Goode	Lee
Clay	Goodlatte	Levin
Cleaver	Gordon	Lewis (CA)
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lewis (GA)
Cohen	Green, Gene	Lewis (KY)
Cole (OK)	Grijalva	Lipinski
Conyers	Gutierrez	LoBiondo
Costa	Hall (NY)	Loeb sack
Costello	Hall (TX)	Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney	Hare	Lowey
Cramer	Harman	Lucas
Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)	

Lungren, Daniel	Paul	Smith (WA)
E.	Payne	Snyder
Lynch	Perlmutter	Solis
Mahoney (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Space
Maloney (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Spratt
Manzullo	Pickering	Stark
Markey	Pomerooy	Stupak
Marshall	Price (NC)	Sutton
Matheson	Pryce (OH)	Tancredito
Matsui	Rahall	Tanner
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Tauscher
McCollum (MN)	Regula	Taylor
McCotter	Rehberg	Thompson (CA)
McCrery	Reichert	Thompson (MS)
McDermott	Renzi	Tiahrt
McGovern	Reyes	Tiberi
McHugh	Reynolds	Tierney
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Towns
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Turner
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Udall (CO)
Rodgers	Ros-Lehtinen	Udall (NM)
McNerney	Ross	Van Hollen
Meehan	Rothman	Velázquez
Meek (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Walsh (NY)
Melancon	Rush	Walz (MN)
Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Wamp
Miller (MI)	Salazar	Wasserman
Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Miller, Gary	T.	Waters
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson
Mitchell	Sarbanes	Watt
Mollohan	Saxton	Waxman
Moore (KS)	Schakowsky	Weiner
Moore (WI)	Schiff	Welch (VT)
Moran (KS)	Schwartz	Weldon (FL)
Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)	Weller
Murphy (CT)	Scott (VA)	Wexler
Murphy, Patrick	Serrano	Whitfield
Murphy, Tim	Sestak	Wicker
Murtha	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Nadler	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)
Napolitano	Sherman	Wolf
Neal (MA)	Shuler	Woolsey
Norton	Shuster	Wu
Oberstar	Simpson	Wynn
Obey	Sires	Yarmuth
Olver	Skelton	Young (AK)
Pallone	Slaughter	Young (FL)
Pascarell	Smith (NJ)	
Pastor	Smith (TX)	

## NOT VOTING—11

Abercrombie	Fortuño	McNulty
Davis (KY)	Hastert	Ortiz
Davis, Jo Ann	Hinojosa	Sessions
Forbes	LaHood	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 1801

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) regarding Lincoln Commission on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 318, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

## AYES—107

Akin  
 Bachmann  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Barton (TX)  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Blunt  
 Boehner  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown-Waite,  
     Ginny  
 Buchanan  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Buyer  
 Camp (MI)  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Carter  
 Chabot  
 Coble  
 Conaway  
 Cooper  
 Davis, David  
 Davis, Tom  
 Deal (GA)  
 Dent  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Duncan  
 Ehlers  
 Feeney  
 Flake  
 Fossella

Franks (AZ)  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Gerlach  
 Gingrey  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Heller  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Hoekstra  
 Inglis (SC)  
 Issa  
 Jindal  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Keller  
 King (IA)  
 Kingston  
 Kline (MN)  
 Lamborn  
 Linder  
 Lungren, Daniel  
     E.  
 Mack  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul (TX)  
 McHenry  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Musgrave  
 Myrick

Neugebauer  
 Pearce  
 Pence  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe  
 Porter  
 Price (GA)  
 Putnam  
 Radanovich  
 Ramstad  
 Reynolds  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sali  
 Schmidt  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Shadegg  
 Shimkus  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Souder  
 Stearns  
 Sullivan  
 Terry  
 Thornberry  
 Upton  
 Walberg  
 Walden (OR)  
 Weller  
 Westmoreland  
 Wilson (SC)

## NOES—318

Ackerman  
 Aderholt  
 Alexander  
 Allen  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Baca  
 Bachus  
 Baird  
 Baker  
 Baldwin  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett (MD)  
 Bean  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonner  
 Bono  
 Boozman  
 Bordallo  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boustany  
 Boyd (FL)  
 Boyd (KS)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Butterfield  
 Calvert  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson  
 Castle  
 Castor  
 Chandler  
 Christensen  
 Clarke  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Cole (OK)  
 Costa  
 Costello

Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Cubin  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis, Lincoln  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Donnelly  
 Doolittle  
 Doyle  
 Drake  
 Dreier  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Ellsworth  
 Emanuel  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 English (PA)  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Everett  
 Faleomavaega  
 Fallon  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Ferguson  
 Filner  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Frank (MA)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Giffords  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillibrand  
 Gillmor  
 Gonzalez  
 Goode  
 Gordon  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez

Hall (NY)  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hare  
 Harman  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hayes  
 Herseth Sandlin  
 Higgins  
 Hill  
 Hinchey  
 Hirono  
 Hobson  
 Hodes  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Hulshof  
 Hunter  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
     (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kirk  
 Klein (FL)  
 Knollenberg  
 Kucinich  
 Kuhl (NY)  
 Lampson  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo

Loeb sack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Lynch  
 Mahoney (FL)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Markey  
 Marshall  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McCotter  
 McCreery  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHugh  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McMorris  
     Rodgers  
 McNeerney  
 Meehan  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Melancon  
 Mica  
 Michaud  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Mitchell  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Murtha  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Norton  
 Nunes  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Oliver  
 Pallone

Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Pickering  
 Pomeroy  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Rodriguez  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppelberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Salazar  
 Sanchez, Linda  
     T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sestak  
 Shays  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter

Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Space  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tancred  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walsh (NY)  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wamp  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Wexler  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—12

Abercrombie  
 Conyers  
 Davis (KY)  
 Davis, Jo Ann

Forbes  
 Fortuño  
 Hastert  
 Hinojosa

LaHood  
 McNulty  
 Ortiz  
 Sessions

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).  
 Members are advised there is 1 minute  
 remaining in the vote.

□ 1804

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EMANUEL

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL)  
 on which further proceedings were  
 postponed and on which the noes pre-  
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has  
 been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 209, noes 217,  
 not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 596]

## AYES—209

Ackerman  
 Allen  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Baca  
 Baird  
 Baldwin  
 Barrow  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bordallo  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boyda (KS)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson  
 Castor  
 Chandler  
 Christensen  
 Clarke  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crowley  
 Cummings  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis, Lincoln  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Donnelly  
 Doyle  
 Ellison  
 Emanuel  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Faleomavaega  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Frank (MA)  
 Giffords  
 Gillibrand  
 Gonzalez

Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Hall (NY)  
 Hare  
 Harman  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Higgins  
 Hinchey  
 Hirono  
 Hodes  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
     (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind  
 Kucinich  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lynch  
 Mahoney (FL)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Markey  
 Marshall  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McGovern  
 McIntyre  
 McNeerney  
 Meehan  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Melancon  
 Michaud  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Mitchell  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy (CT)

Murphy, Patrick  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Norton  
 Oberstar  
 Oliver  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Pickering  
 Pomeroy  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Rodriguez  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppelberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sanchez, Linda  
     T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shuler  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Solis  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Wexler  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Yarmuth

## NOES—217

Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Baker  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Bartlett (MD)  
 Barton (TX)  
 Bean  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Blunt  
 Boehner  
 Bonner  
 Bono  
 Boozman  
 Boren  
 Boustany  
 Boyd (FL)

Brady (TX)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown-Waite,  
     Ginny  
 Buchanan  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Buyer  
 Calvert  
 Camp (MI)  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Capuano  
 Carter  
 Castle  
 Chabot  
 Coble  
 Cole (OK)  
 Conaway  
 Crenshaw  
 Cubin

Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Davis, David  
 Davis, Tom  
 Deal (GA)  
 Dent  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Doolittle  
 Drake  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Edwards  
 Ehlers  
 Ellsworth  
 Emerson  
 English (PA)  
 Everett  
 Fallon  
 Feeney  
 Ferguson  
 Flake  
 Fortenberry



Fossella Lucas Rohrabacher  
 Foxx Lungren, Daniel Ros-Lehtinen  
 Franks (AZ) E. Roskam  
 Frelinghuysen Mack Ross  
 Gallegly Manzullo Royce  
 Garrett (NJ) Marchant Ryan (WI)  
 Gerlach McCarthy (CA) Salazar  
 Gilchrest McCaul (TX) Sali  
 Gillmor McCotter Chabot  
 Gingrey McCreery Coble  
 Gohmert McDermott Cooper  
 Goode McHenry Davis, David  
 Goodlatte McHugh Deal (GA)  
 Gordon McKeon Duncan  
 Granger McMorris Flake  
 Graves Rodgers Shuster  
 Hall (TX) Mica Simpson  
 Hastings (WA) Miller (FL) Skelton  
 Hayes Miller (MI) Smith (NE)  
 Heller Miller, Gary Smith (NJ)  
 Hensarling Moran (KS) Smith (TX)  
 Herger Murphy, Tim Smith (WA)  
 Hereth Sandlin Murtha Snyder  
 Hobson Musgrave Souder  
 Hoekstra Myrick Space  
 Hulshof Neugebauer Stearns  
 Hunter Nunes Sullivan  
 Inglis (SC) Obey Tancredo  
 Issa Pearce Tanner  
 Jindal Pence Peterson (MN)  
 Johnson (IL) Peterson (PA) Terry  
 Johnson, Sam Thornberry  
 Jordan Petri Tiahrt  
 Kaptur Pickering Tiberi  
 Keller Pitts Turner  
 King (IA) Platts Upton  
 King (NY) Poe Walberg  
 Kingston Porter Walden (OR)  
 Kirk Price (GA) Walsh (NY)  
 Klein (FL) Pryce (OH) Wamp  
 Kline (MN) Putnam Weldon (FL)  
 Knollenberg Radanovich Weller  
 Kuhl (NY) Ramstad Westmoreland  
 Lamborn Regula Whitfield  
 Lampson Rehberg Wicker  
 Latham Reichert Wilson (NM)  
 LaTourette Renzi Wilson (SC)  
 Lewis (CA) Reynolds Wolf  
 Lewis (KY) Rogers (AL) Young (AK)  
 Linder Rogers (KY) Young (FL)  
 LoBiondo Rogers (MI)

## NOT VOTING—11

Abercrombie Fortuño McNulty  
 Davis (KY) Hastert Ortiz  
 Davis, Jo Ann Hinojosa Sessions  
 Forbes LaHood

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).  
 Members are advised there is 1 minute  
 to record their vote.

□ 1808

Mr. GRAVES changed his vote from  
 “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF  
CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from California (Mr. CAMP-  
 BELL) regarding earmarks on which  
 further proceedings were postponed and  
 on which the noes prevailed by voice  
 vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has  
 been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 48, noes 372,  
 not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 597]  
 AYES—48  
 Heller  
 Hensarling  
 Issa  
 Jindal  
 Jordan  
 King (IA)  
 Kline (MN)  
 Lamborn  
 Linder  
 Mack  
 Marchant  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 Miller (FL)  
 Musgrave  
 Myrick  
 Pence  
 Bachmann  
 Burgess  
 Royce  
 Burton (IN)  
 Buyer  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Chabot  
 Coble  
 Cooper  
 Davis, David  
 Deal (GA)  
 Duncan  
 Flake  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Goode  
 Goodlatte

Ackerman  
 Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Allen  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Baca  
 Bachus  
 Baird  
 Baker  
 Baldwin  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett (MD)  
 Barton (TX)  
 Bean  
 Becerra  
 Berkeley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt  
 Boehner  
 Bonner  
 Bono  
 Boozman  
 Bordallo  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boustany  
 Boyd (FL)  
 Boyda (KS)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Buchanan  
 Butterfield  
 Calvert  
 Camp (MI)  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson  
 Carter  
 Castle  
 Castor  
 Chandler  
 Christensen  
 Clarke  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Cole (OK)  
 Conaway  
 Conyers  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney

## NOES—372

Cramer  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Cubin  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis, Lincoln  
 Davis, Tom  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Dent  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Donnelly  
 Doolittle  
 Doyle  
 Drake  
 Dreier  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Ellsworth  
 Emanuel  
 Engel  
 English (PA)  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Everett  
 Faleomavaega  
 Fallin  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Ferguson  
 Filner  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Frank (MA)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Gerlach  
 Giffords  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillibrand  
 Gillmor  
 Gingrey  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez  
 Gordon  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Hall (NY)  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hare  
 Harman  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Herger  
 Hereth Sandlin  
 Higgins  
 Hill  
 Hinchey  
 Hirono  
 Hobson  
 Hodes

Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Melancon  
 Mica  
 Michaud  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Mitchell  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Murtha  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Norton  
 Nunes  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Pickering  
 Poe  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putham  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula

Hoekstra  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Hulshof  
 Hunter  
 Inglis (SC)  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Keller  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kirk  
 Klein (FL)  
 Knollenberg  
 Kucinich  
 Kuhl (NY)  
 Lampson  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Lynch  
 Mahoney (FL)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Manzullo  
 Markey  
 Marshall  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCaul (TX)  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McCotter  
 McCreery  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHugh  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNeerney  
 Meehan

Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rodriguez  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Salazar  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schmidt  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sestak  
 Shays  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Souder  
 Space  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tiahrt  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh (NY)  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wamp  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—17

Abercrombie Forbes McNulty  
 Davis (KY) Fortuño Miller, George  
 Davis, Jo Ann Hastert Ortiz  
 Ehlers Hinojosa Sessions  
 Emerson LaHood Shimkus  
 Feeney McHenry

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).  
 Members are advised 1 minute remains  
 to record their votes.

□ 1811

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WICKER

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICK-  
 ER) on which further proceedings were  
 postponed and on which the ayes pre-  
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has  
 been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 295, noes 127,  
 not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 598]

## AYES—295

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Berkley  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Bordallo  
Boren  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Coble  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellsworth  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett

Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jindal  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCauley (TX)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Melancon

Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mitchell  
Moore (KS)  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Paul  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp

Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield

Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)

Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOES—127

Arcuri  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Capps  
Carson  
Castor  
Christensen  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Crowley  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dingell  
Ellison  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Faleomavaega  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Hodes

Holt  
Honda  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kennedy  
Kilpatrick  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matsui  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oliver

Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Price (NC)  
Rangel  
Rodriguez  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Solis  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie  
Buyer  
Conyers  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, Jo Ann

Forbes  
Fortuño  
Hastert  
Hinojosa  
LaHood

McNulty  
Norton  
Ortiz  
Sessions  
Waxman

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised they have 30 seconds to record their vote.

□ 1814

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, for part of Thursday, June 28, 2007, I was absent from the House for a family medical emergency.

Had I been present I would have voted:

On rollcall No. 584—"no"—Cardoza Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 585—"no"—DeFazio Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 586—"no"—Price (GA) Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 587—"no"—Davis (VA) Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 588—"aye"—Garrett Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 589—"aye"—Souder Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 590—"no"—Flake Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 591—"no"—Flake Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 592—"no"—Flake Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 593—"no"—Flake Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 594—"no"—Flake Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 595—"no"—Campbell Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 596—"no"—Emanuel Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 597—"no"—Campbell Amendment to H.R. 2643.

On rollcall No. 598—"aye"—Wicker Amendment to H.R. 2643.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 309, noes 115, answered "present" 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 599]

## AYES—309

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baker  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Berman  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Bordallo  
Boren  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carson  
Carter  
Castle  
Castor

Chabot  
Chandler  
Christensen  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Faleomavaega  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Gene  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hill  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Hooley  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jindal  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Kagen  
Keller  
Kildee  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline (MN)

Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Napolitano  
Neugebauer

Norton  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano

Shadegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wick  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOES—115

Ackerman  
Allen  
Arcuri  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carney  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Ellison  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Grijalva

Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Harman  
Higgins  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Jackson (IL)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kilpatrick  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCullum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Miller, George

Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal (MA)  
Olver  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Price (NC)  
Rangel  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Sestak  
Slaughter  
Solis  
Stark  
Sutton  
Tauscher  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Towns  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Cohen

## NOT VOTING—12

Abercrombie  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Forbes  
Fortuño

Hastert  
Hinojosa  
LaHood  
McNulty

Ortiz  
Sessions  
Tierney  
Waxman

□ 1820

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. TOWNS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair corrects the previous announcement on the Wicker amendment. It was 295 ayes, 127 noes, and the amendment was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 276, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 600]

## AYES—149

Aderholt  
Akin  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Capito  
Carter  
Chabot  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)

Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Flake  
Fossella  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Hall (TX)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hoekstra  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Jindal  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
Kingston  
Kline (MN)

Knollenberg  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Poe  
Price (GA)  
Putnam

Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Reynolds  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner

Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi

## NOES—276

Ackerman  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bordallo  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite, Ginny  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Cantor  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castle  
Castor  
Chandler  
Christensen  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett

Faleomavaega  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Fortenberry  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseht Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCullum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh

McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Norton  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Platts  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher

Thompson (CA) Walz (MN) Wilson (NM)  
Thompson (MS) Wasserman Wilson (OH)  
Tierney Schultz  
Towns Waters  
Udall (CO) Watson  
Udall (NM) Watt  
Van Hollen Weiner  
Velázquez Welch (VT)  
Visclosky Weldon (FL)  
Walsh (NY) Wexler

## NOT VOTING—12

Abercrombie Fortuño McNulty  
Clarke Hastert Ortiz  
Davis, Jo Ann Hinojosa Sessions  
Forbes LaHood Waxman

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

## □ 1824

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 233, not voting 13, as follows:

## [Roll No. 601]

## AYES—191

Aderholt Cole (OK) Hall (TX)  
Akin Conaway Hastings (WA)  
Alexander Cooper Hayes  
Altmire Crenshaw Heller  
Bachmann Cubin Hensarling  
Bachus Culberson Herger  
Baker Davis (KY) Hoekstra  
Barrett (SC) Davis, David Hulshof  
Bartlett (MD) Davis, Tom Hunter  
Barton (TX) Deal (GA) Inglis (SC)  
Bean Dent Issa  
Biggert Diaz-Balart, L. Jindal  
Bilbray Diaz-Balart, M. Johnson (IL)  
Bilirakis Donnelly Johnson, Sam  
Bishop (UT) Drake Jones (NC)  
Blackburn Dreier Jordan  
Blunt Duncan Keller  
Boehner Ellsworth King (IA)  
Bonner Emerson King (NY)  
Bono English (PA) Kingston  
Boozman Everett Kline (MN)  
Brady (TX) Fallin Knollenberg  
Brown (SC) Feeney Lamborn  
Brown-Waite, Ferguson Lampson  
Ginny Flake Lewis (KY)  
Buchanan Fossella Linder  
Burgess Foxx LoBiondo  
Burton (IN) Franks (AZ) Lucas  
Buyer Frelinghuysen Lungren, Daniel  
Calvert Gallegly E.  
Camp (MI) Garrett (NJ) Mack  
Campbell (CA) Gerlach Mahoney (FL)  
Cannon Gillmor Manzullo  
Cantor Gingrey Marchant  
Capito Gohmert Matheson  
Carter Goode McCarthy (CA)  
Castle Goodlatte McCaul (TX)  
Chabot Granger McCotter  
Coble Graves McCreery

McHenry Price (GA) Smith (TX)  
McHugh Pryce (OH) Souder  
McKeon Putnam Stearns  
McMorris Radanovich Sullivan  
Rodgers Ramstad Tancredo  
Mica Rehberg Tanner  
Miller (FL) Reynolds Taylor  
Miller (MI) Rogers (AL) Terry  
Miller, Gary Rogers (KY) Thornberry  
Mitchell Rogers (MI) Tiahrt  
Moran (KS) Rohrabacher Tiberi  
Murphy, Patrick Ros-Lehtinen Turner  
Murphy, Tim Roskam Upton  
Musgrave Royce Walberg  
Myrick Ryan (WI) Walden (OR)  
Neugebauer Sali Wamp  
Nunes Saxton Weldon (FL)  
Paul Schmidt Weller  
Pearce Sensenbrenner Westmoreland  
Pence Shadegg Whitfield  
Petri Shays Wicker  
Pickering Shimkus Wilson (NM)  
Pitts Shuler Wilson (SC)  
Platts Shuster Young (AK)  
Poe Smith (NE) Young (FL)  
Porter Smith (NJ)

## NOES—233

Ackerman Fortenberry Meehan  
Allen Frank (MA) Meek (FL)  
Andrews Giffords Meeks (NY)  
Arcuri Gilchrest Melancon  
Baca Gillibrand Michaud  
Baird Gonzalez Miller (NC)  
Baldwin Gordon Miller, George  
Barrow Green, Al Mollohan  
Becerra Green, Gene Moore (KS)  
Berkley Grijalva Moore (WI)  
Berman Gutierrez Moran (VA)  
Berry Hall (NY) Murphy (CT)  
Bishop (GA) Hare Murtha  
Bishop (NY) Harman Nadler  
Blumenauer Hastings (FL) Napolitano  
Bordallo Herseht Sandlin Neal (MA)  
Boren Higgins Norton  
Boswell Hill Oberstar  
Boucher Hinchey Obey  
Boustany Hirono Oliver  
Boyd (FL) Hobson Pallone  
Boyda (KS) Hodes Pascrell  
Brady (PA) Holden Pastor  
Braley (IA) Holt Payne  
Brown, Corrine Honda Perlmutter  
Butterfield Hooley Peterson (MN)  
Capps Hoyer Peterson (PA)  
Capuano Inslee Pomeroy  
Cardoza Israel Price (NC)  
Carnahan Jackson (IL) Rahall  
Jackson-Lee Rangel  
(TX) Regula  
Jefferson Reichert  
Johnson (GA) Renzi  
Jones (OH) Rodriguez  
Kagen Ross  
Kanjorski Rothman  
Kaptur Roybal-Allard  
Kennedy Ruppertsberger  
Kildee Rush  
Kilpatrick Ryan (OH)  
Kind Salazar  
Kirk Sanchez, Linda  
Klein (FL) T.  
Kucinich Sanchez, Loretta  
Kuhl (NY) Sarbanes  
Langevin Schakowsky  
Lantos Schiff  
Larsen (WA) Schwartz  
Larson (CT) Scott (GA)  
Latham Scott (VA)  
LaTourette Serrano  
Lee Sestak  
Levin Shea-Porter  
Lewis (CA) Sherman  
Lewis (GA) Simpson  
Lipinski Sires  
Loeb sack Skelton  
Loftgren, Zoe Slaughter  
Lowey Smith (WA)  
Lynch Snyder  
Markey Solis  
Marshall Space  
Matsui Spratt  
McCarthy (NY) Stark  
McCollum (MN) Stupak  
McDermott Sutton  
McGovern Tauscher  
McIntyre Thompson (CA)  
McNerney Thompson (MS)

Tierney Walz (MN) Wexler  
Towns Wasserman Wilson (OH)  
Udall (CO) Schultz Wolf  
Udall (NM) Waters Woolsey  
Van Hollen Watson Wu  
Velázquez Watt Wynn  
Visclosky Weiner Yarmuth  
Walsh (NY) Welch (VT)

## NOT VOTING—13

Abercrombie Hastert Ortiz  
Davis, Jo Ann Hinojosa Sessions  
Edwards LaHood Waxman  
Forbes Maloney (NY)  
Fortuño McNulty

## □ 1827

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS.

## MUSGRAVE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 220, not voting 12, as follows:

## [Roll No. 602]

## AYES—205

Aderholt Davis (KY) Hunter  
Akin Davis, David Inglis (SC)  
Alexander Davis, Tom Issa  
Altmire Deal (GA) Jindal  
Bachmann Dent Johnson (IL)  
Bachus Diaz-Balart, L. Johnson, Sam  
Baker Diaz-Balart, M. Jones (NC)  
Barrett (SC) Donnelly Jordan  
Bartlett (MD) Drake Keller  
Barton (TX) Dreier King (IA)  
Bean Duncan King (NY)  
Biggert Ellsworth Kingston  
Bilbray Emerson Kline (MN)  
Bilirakis English (PA) Knollenberg  
Bishop (UT) Everett Lamborn  
Blackburn Fallin Lampson  
Blunt Feeney LaTourette  
Boehner Ferguson Lewis (CA)  
Bonner Flake Lewis (KY)  
Bono Fortenberry Linder  
Boozman Fossella LoBiondo  
Brady (TX) Foxx Lucas  
Brown (SC) Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel  
Brown-Waite, Frelinghuysen E.  
Ginny Gallegly Mack  
Buchanan Garrett (NJ) Mahoney (FL)  
Burgess Gerlach Manzullo  
Burton (IN) Giffords Marchant  
Buyer Gillibrand Matheson  
Calvert Gollmer McCarthy (CA)  
Camp (MI) Gingrey McCaul (TX)  
Campbell (CA) Gohmert McCotter  
Cannon Goode McCreery  
Cantor Goodlatte McHenry  
Capito Granger McHugh  
Carney Graves McKeon  
Carter Hall (TX) McMorris  
Castle Hastings (WA) Rodgers  
Chabot Hayes McNerney  
Coble Heller Melancon  
Cole (OK) Hensarling Mica  
Conaway Herger Miller (FL)  
Cooper Hill Miller (MI)  
Crenshaw Hobson Miller, Gary  
Cubin Hoekstra Mitchell  
Culberson Hulshof Moran (KS)

Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Musgrave  
 Myrick  
 Neugebauer  
 Nunes  
 Paul  
 Pearce  
 Pence  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Pickering  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poole  
 Porter  
 Price (GA)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putnam  
 Radanovich  
 Ramstad  
 Rehberg  
 Reynolds  
 Rogers (AL)

## NOES—220

Ackerman  
 Allen  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Baca  
 Baird  
 Baldwin  
 Barrow  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bordallo  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boustany  
 Boyd (FL)  
 Boyda (KS)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carson  
 Castor  
 Chandler  
 Christensen  
 Clarke  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Conyers  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis, Lincoln  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doolittle  
 Doyle  
 Edwards  
 Ehlers  
 Ellison  
 Emanuel  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Faleomavaega  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Frank (MA)  
 Gilchrest

Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sali  
 Saxton  
 Schmidt  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Shadegg  
 Shays  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Souder  
 Stearns  
 Sullivan  
 Tancred

Tanner  
 Taylor  
 Terry  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Walberg  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh (NY)  
 Wamp  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weller  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Norton  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Oliver  
 Pallone  
 Pascarell  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Pomeroy  
 Price (NC)  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Rodriguez  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Salazar  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sestak  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Space  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tauscher  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (IN)  
 Buyer  
 Calvert  
 Camp (MI)  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carter  
 Chabot  
 Coble  
 Cole (OK)  
 Conaway  
 Costello  
 Cramer

Wexler  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Abercrombie  
 Davis, Jo Ann  
 Forbes  
 Fortuño

Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Hastert  
 Hinojosa  
 Kirk  
 LaHood

Wynn  
 Yarmuth  
 McNulty  
 Ortiz  
 Sessions  
 Waxman

## NOT VOTING—12

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1830

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GOODE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 200, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 603]

## AYES—224

Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Baker  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett (MD)  
 Barton (TX)  
 Berry  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Blunt  
 Boehner  
 Bonner  
 Boozman  
 Bordallo  
 Boren  
 Boucher  
 Boustany  
 Boyda (KS)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Buchanan  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Buyer  
 Calvert  
 Camp (MI)  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carter  
 Chabot  
 Coble  
 Cole (OK)  
 Conaway  
 Costello  
 Cramer  
 Crenshaw  
 Cubin  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (KY)  
 Davis, David  
 Davis, Lincoln  
 Davis, Tom  
 Deal (GA)  
 Dent  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Donnelly  
 Doolittle  
 Drake  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Ehlers  
 Ellsworth  
 Emerson  
 Etheridge  
 Everett  
 Faleomavaega  
 Fallin  
 Feeney  
 Ferguson  
 Flake  
 Fortenberry  
 Fossella  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Gallegly  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Gerlach  
 Gillmor  
 Gingrey  
 Gohmert  
 Goode  
 Goodlatte  
 Gordon  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Heller  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Herseth Sandlin  
 Hobson  
 Hoekstra  
 Hulshof  
 Hunter  
 Inglis (SC)  
 Jindal  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jordan  
 Keller  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kline (MN)  
 Kuhl (NY)  
 Lamborn  
 Lampson  
 Latham  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Lucas  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Mack  
 Mahoney (FL)  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Marshall  
 Matheson  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul (TX)  
 McCotter  
 McCrery  
 McHenry  
 McHugh  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Melancon  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Moran (KS)  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Musgrave  
 Myrick  
 Neugebauer  
 Norton  
 Nunes  
 Obey  
 Paul  
 Pearce  
 Pence  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Pickering  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe  
 Porter  
 Price (GA)  
 Putnam  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Regula  
 Rehberg

Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reynolds  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Royce  
 Ruppersberger  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Salazar  
 Sali  
 Saxton  
 Schmidt  
 Scott (GA)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Shadegg  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Skelton  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Souder

## NOES—200

Ackerman  
 Allen  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Baca  
 Baird  
 Baldwin  
 Bean  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bono  
 Boswell  
 Boyd (FL)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carson  
 Castle  
 Castor  
 Chandler  
 Christensen  
 Clarke  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle  
 Ellison  
 Emanuel  
 Engel  
 English (PA)  
 Eshoo  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Frank (MA)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Giffords  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillibrand  
 Gonzalez  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva

Gutierrez  
 Hall (NY)  
 Hare  
 Harman  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Higgins  
 Hill  
 Hinchey  
 Hirono  
 Hodes  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind  
 Kirk  
 Klein (FL)  
 Knollenberg  
 Kucinich  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 LaTourette  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Loebach  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lynch  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Markey  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 Meehan  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Michaud  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Mitchell  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (VA)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy (CT)

Space  
 Spratt  
 Stearns  
 Sullivan  
 Tancred  
 Tanner  
 Taylor  
 Terry  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Walberg  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh (NY)  
 Wamp  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weller  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

Murphy, Patrick  
 Murtha  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Oberstar  
 Oliver  
 Pallone  
 Pascarell  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Pomeroy  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Rangel  
 Reyes  
 Rodriguez  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sestak  
 Shays  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Stark  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tauscher  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Wexler  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Woolsey  
 Wynn  
 Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—13

Abercrombie	Hastert	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	Hinojosa	Waxman
Edwards	LaHood	Wu
Forbes	McNulty	
Fortuño	Ortiz	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised they have 1 minute to record their vote.

□ 1834

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MARKEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

WISHING FAREWELL TO THE HON. MARTIN MEEHAN

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise so that we can note this important moment, and that moment is that, although it is with great sadness for this Chamber and the members of the Massachusetts delegation, but I think great joy for his family, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is about to cast his final vote as a Member of this Chamber, and I would like to give the gentleman the proper farewell that he deserves because he has served well and long in this institution. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I thank the dean of our delegation and all of my colleagues from Massachusetts and all of my colleagues in this House.

I have a plane to catch, so I will be brief.

I want to thank my wife, Ellen, and my wonderful family for all that they have had to tolerate over the years. I want to thank the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts for the confidence that they have demonstrated in me in giving me this great honor to serve in this great institution.

I want to thank former staff members of mine, some of whom are here, for their dedication, their energy, their hard work day in and day out.

I want to thank my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, that I have worked with. I have tried to work in a bipartisan way most of the time. I leave this House; it was the most difficult decision professionally that I have ever had to make because I love this House, I love the institution, I love the friendships and colleagues that I have been so honored to work with over the years.

But I also believe in the University of Massachusetts at Lowell. That is where I graduated. I walked in the door, one of seven children in a large family in Lowell, Massachusetts, and wouldn't have had the opportunity to go to college or to achieve things I wanted to achieve in my life without that institution. So as difficult as it is, I have a passion for the institution. I am going to leave.

So thank you very much for wonderful friendships. I will be back from

time to time. Be careful you don't eliminate too many earmarks while you are at it here.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 257, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 604]

## AYES—165

Aderholt	Gallegly	Moran (KS)
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave
Alexander	Gingrey	Myrick
Altmire	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Goode	Nunes
Bachus	Goodlatte	Paul
Baker	Gordon	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Barrow	Hall (TX)	Petri
Bartlett (MD)	Hastings (WA)	Pickering
Barton (TX)	Hayes	Pitts
Biggart	Heller	Platts
Bilbray	Hensarling	Poe
Bilirakis	Herger	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Hoekstra	Putnam
Blunt	Hulshof	Radanovich
Boehner	Hunter	Ramstad
Bonner	Inglis (SC)	Rehberg
Boozman	Issa	Reynolds
Boustany	Jindal	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Jordan	Roskam
Burgess	Keller	Ross
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Royce
Buyer	King (NY)	Sali
Calvert	Kingston	Saxton
Camp (MI)	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Campbell (CA)	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Capito	Lamborn	Shuler
Carney	Lampson	Shuster
Chabot	Latham	Simpson
Coble	LaTourette	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Linder	Souder
Cubin	LoBlondo	Stearns
Culberson	Lucas	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	Mack	Tancred
Davis, David	Manzullo	Taylor
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Terry
Donnelly	Marshall	Tiahrt
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Turner
Dreier	McCotter	Upton
Duncan	McHenry	Walberg
Emerson	McHugh	Wamp
Everett	McKeon	Westmoreland
Fallin	McMorris	Whitfield
Feeney	Rodgers	Wicker
Fortenberry	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	

## NOES—257

Ackerman	Giffords	Neal (MA)
Allen	Gilchrest	Norton
Andrews	Gillibrand	Oberstar
Arcuri	Gillmor	Obey
Baca	Gonzalez	Olver
Baird	Granger	Pallone
Baldwin	Green, Al	Pascarell
Bean	Green, Gene	Pastor
Becerra	Grijalva	Payne
Berkley	Hall (NY)	Pearce
Berman	Hare	Perlmutter
Berry	Harman	Peterson (MN)
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pomeroy
Bishop (NY)	Herseth Sandlin	Porter
Blumenauer	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bono	Hill	Rahall
Bordallo	Hinchey	Rangel
Boren	Hirono	Regula
Boswell	Hodes	Reichert
Boucher	Holden	Renzi
Boyd (FL)	Holt	Reyes
Boyda (KS)	Honda	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Hooley	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	Hoyer	Rothman
Braley (IA)	Inlee	Roybal-Allard
Brown, Corrine	Israel	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Cannon	Jackson-Lee	Ryan (OH)
Capps	(TX)	Ryan (WI)
Capuano	Jefferson	Salazar
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Carson	Jones (OH)	Sanchez, Loretta
Carter	Kagen	Schakowsky
Castle	Kanjorski	Schiff
Castor	Kaptur	Schwartz
Chandler	Kennedy	Scott (GA)
Christensen	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Clarke	Kilpatrick	Serrano
Clay	Kind	Sestak
Cleaver	Kirk	Shadegg
Clyburn	Klein (FL)	Shays
Cohen	Kucinich	Shea-Porter
Cole (OK)	Langevin	Sires
Conyers	Lantos	Skelton
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Slaughter
Costa	Larson (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Costello	Lee	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Levin	Snyder
Cramer	Lewis (CA)	Solis
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Space
Cuellar	Lipinski	Spratt
Cummings	Loeback	Stark
Davis (AL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Stupak
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Lungren, Daniel	Tanner
Davis, Lincoln	E.	Tauscher
Davis, Tom	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Mahoney (FL)	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Thornberry
Delahunt	Markey	Tierney
DeLauro	Matheson	Towns
Dent	Matsui	Udall (CO)
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCarthy (NY)	Udall (NM)
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCollum (MN)	Van Hollen
Dicks	McCrery	Velázquez
Dingell	McDermott	Visclosky
Doggett	McGovern	Walden (OR)
Doyle	McNerney	Walsh (NY)
Edwards	Meehan	Walz (MN)
Ehlers	Meek (FL)	Wasserman
Ellison	Meeks (NY)	Schultz
Ellsworth	Melancon	Waters
Emanuel	Michaud	Watson
Engel	Miller (NC)	Watt
English (PA)	Miller, George	Weiner
Eshoo	Mitchell	Welch (VT)
Etheridge	Mollohan	Weldon (FL)
Faleomavaega	Moore (KS)	Weller
Farr	Moore (WI)	Wexler
Fattah	Moran (VA)	Wilson (NM)
Ferguson	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (OH)
Filner	Murphy, Patrick	Wolf
Flake	Murphy, Tim	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Wu
Frelinghuysen	Nadler	Wynn
Gerlach	Napolitano	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie	Hastert	Ortiz
Davis, Jo Ann	Hinojosa	Sarbanes
Forbes	LaHood	Sessions
Fortuño	McIntyre	Sherman
Gutierrez	McNulty	Waxman



## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1841

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2008".

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my concerns about the way taxpayer funds have recently been spent at the General Services Administration (GSA). Today, the House is expected to pass H.R. 2829, a bill which makes appropriations for financial services and general government for Fiscal Year 2008, and which provides funding for the GSA.

If any agency should be trusted to spend American taxpayers' money responsibly, it is the GSA, the federal government's premier acquisition agency. Unfortunately, reports that current GSA Administrator Lurita Doan used federal government property and resources to engage in partisan campaign activities with political appointees of the GSA provide evidence that the head of this agency has placed the interests of the Republican party over the interests of the American public.

On January 26, 2007 Ms. Doan attended a meeting at GSA at which J. Scott Jennings, the Special Assistant to the President and the Deputy Director of Political Affairs at the White House, gave a 28-page PowerPoint presentation which reviewed the 2006 election results and outlined the Republican party's top targets in upcoming elections. According to several witnesses who attended the meeting, after this presentation Ms. Doan asked the more than 30 political appointees in attendance how they could use GSA resources to help Republican candidates win future elections. This presentation and Ms. Doan's comments are not only blatant violations of the Hatch Act, which restricts the political activities of Executive Branch employees, but are also a gross abuse of taxpayers' money and trust.

Ms. Doan has appeared twice before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and claims that she cannot remember Mr. Jennings' presentation, or the comments she made. Despite the fact that the Office of Special Counsel found that Ms. Doan "violated the Hatch Act's prohibition against using [her] official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election when [she] solicited over thirty subordinate employees to engage in political activity," she also claims that she cannot answer questions about the legality or appropriateness of the briefing. In light of Ms. Doan's lack of contrition and apparent confusion about what constitutes an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars, it is understandable that many of us in the Congress would be concerned about the way the funds we are appropriating today to GSA will be used.

While I support the passage of this bill, I believe that we must continue to work to ensure that appropriated GSA funds are spent on legal and legitimate purposes—like managing federal buildings, buying government equipment and supplies, and working with other

agencies to purchase goods and services for the government. I hope and trust that the funds we are appropriating to GSA today will be spent legally and responsibly, and I look forward to continuing our Congressional oversight of the GSA.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2829, the Financial Services—General Government Appropriations bill. This bill enhances key American priorities, while providing less overall than the President requested for agencies in this bill.

We are committed to making our tax system fairer for millions of Americans—and to enhance enforcement to make sure everyone pays what they owe, not just those who play by the rules, while improving taxpayers' services. This bill will spur job creation and make the economy work for everyone—by restoring the President's cuts in small business loans, rejecting his efforts to slash capital and financial services available to underserved communities (CDFI), and by strengthening consumer protections.

We are also working to make sure that every vote counts in our elections, and to strengthen law enforcement, both against terrorism and in the war on drugs. This bill meets two key commitments of this Congress: it has complete transparency on its earmarks, and it also cuts the amount for earmarks in the bill in half.

Our bill lowers the cost of Small Business 7(a) loans and rejects the President's proposal to stop this program that helps small businesses start-up and grow. The 7(a) loan program accounts for roughly 30 percent of all long-term small business borrowing in America, and is the only source of affordable, long-term financing for many of our Nation's small businesses, including many in South Texas.

I'm pleased that the bill includes greater access to capital for economic development in disadvantaged and rural communities. We reject the President's proposal to cut by 50 percent the availability of credit, capital and financial services to underserved communities through the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund. Instead, our bill provides \$46 million more than last year to support economic development and financial services in disadvantaged and rural communities through housing loans, micro-business loans, community development banks and credit unions.

The report lists the recipient and the sponsor for each earmark contained in the bill. Of the 165 earmarks in the bill, 148 were requested by lawmakers and 17 by President Bush. Furthermore, each sponsor has filed a certification that the sponsor and the sponsor's spouse have no financial interest in the earmark, which is publicly available.

I am pleased the committee included funding for the University of Texas at Brownsville's International Trade Center. Brownsville has always been the front door to international trade given its proximity to Mexico and the land and sea ports in the city. This funding will be used to establish an International Trade Center at the UTB International Technology Education and Commerce Campus (ITECC) which will house all of the services required to conduct international trade including: international law, accounting, banking, insurance, logistics services, export-import marketing services, U.S. customs, government trade services and industry showrooms for specific target sectors such as medical, communications, and computer technology.

By concentrating all of the components for trade in one location the ITC will generate significantly higher levels of international trade and associated jobs in Brownsville, making this an excellent investment in South Texas and the Nation.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2829) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 517, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEWIS of California. In its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lewis of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2829 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back promptly to the House with an amendment designating funding for the Internal Revenue Service under such bill as available only for administering, implementing, and enforcing existing Federal taxes and tariffs as enacted on the date of the enactment of such bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, the purpose of this motion to recommit is simple. It recommits the bill back to committee to make clear that the funding provided to the IRS in this bill is only available to administer, implement, and enforce existing tax laws.

The majority party's budget plan includes implementing the biggest tax

increase in history, and this motion would prevent that from taking place.

While the economy is not functioning perfectly, the indicators show that the economy is strong. GDP in 2006 was 3.4 percent above 2005.

□ 1845

Capital investment increased by 6.8 percent in 2006. Unemployment is at 4.6 percent. Tax receipts increased by 11.8 percent in fiscal year 2006, on top of fiscal year 2005's increase of 14.6 percent. So while Congress and the administration have lowered taxes, the economy has grown and the tax revenues have increased. Implementing new tax increases, as the majority party's budget proposes, will have a chilling effect on our economy and the American family as more of their hard-earned money comes to Washington.

While the deficit, which is estimated to be \$244 billion in fiscal year 2007, is very troubling, tax collections are at an all-time high. Instead of increasing taxes to address the deficit and possibly reversing economic growth and further burdening the American family, I believe we must put more focus on controlling spending, both mandatory spending, and discretionary programs as well.

This motion will prohibit the IRS from implementing new taxes, protecting the American family and our economy.

I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I realize that with a house full of colleagues, I should make a profound and eloquent statement, but here it goes.

Madam Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of the House that adoption of the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California will kill the bill. The motion instructs the committee to report the bill back promptly rather than forthwith.

Madam Speaker, section 1002(b) of the House manual states, "Unlike the case of the motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith, the adoption of which occasions an immediate report on the floor, the adoption of a motion to recommit with instructions to report back promptly sends the bill to committee, whose eventual report, if any, would not be immediately before the House."

Madam Speaker, a vote for this motion to recommit kills the bill. A vote against the motion will allow the bill to go forward to final passage.

I urge prompt defeat of the motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 199, nays 222, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 605]

YEAS—199

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer
Akin	Gallegly	Nunes
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Paul
Bachmann	Gerlach	Pearce
Bachus	Gilchrest	Pence
Baker	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Petri
Barrow	Gohmert	Pickering
Bartlett (MD)	Goode	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Platts
Bean	Granger	Porter
Biggert	Graves	Price (GA)
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Radanovich
Blackburn	Heller	Ramstad
Blunt	Hensarling	Regula
Boehner	Herger	Rehberg
Bonner	Hobson	Reichert
Bono	Hoekstra	Renzi
Boozman	Hulshof	Reynolds
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Jindal	Rohrabacher
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Royce
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	Keller	Sali
Calvert	King (IA)	Saxton
Camp (MI)	King (NY)	Schmidt
Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Kirk	Shadegg
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Shays
Capito	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Carter	Kuhl (NY)	Shuler
Castle	Lamborn	Shuster
Chabot	Lampson	Simpson
Coble	Latham	Smith (NE)
Cole (OK)	LaTourette	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Cubin	Linder	Stearns
Culberson	LoBiondo	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Tancredo
Davis, David	Lungren, Daniel	Terry
Davis, Tom	E.	Thornberry
Deal (GA)	Mack	Tiahrt
Dent	Manzullo	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Turner
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Upton
Doolittle	McCaul (TX)	Walberg
Drake	McCotter	Walden (OR)
Dreier	McCrery	Walsh (NY)
Duncan	McHenry	Wamp
Ehlers	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Emerson	McKeon	Weller
English (PA)	McMorris	Westmoreland
Everett	Rodgers	Whitfield
Fallin	Mica	Wicker
Feeney	Miller (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Ferguson	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Flake	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Young (AK)
Fossella	Murphy, Tim	Young (FL)
Fox	Musgrave	
Franks (AZ)	Myrick	

NAYS—222

Ackerman	Arcuri	Becerra
Allen	Baca	Berkley
Altmire	Baird	Berman
Andrews	Baldwin	Berry

Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Obey
Bishop (NY)	Hill	Oliver
Blumenauer	Hinchee	Pallone
Boren	Hirono	Pascarell
Boswell	Hodes	Pastor
Boucher	Holden	Payne
Boyd (FL)	Holt	Perlmutter
Boyda (KS)	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Brady (PA)	Hoolley	Pomeroy
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brown, Corrine	Inslie	Rahall
Butterfield	Israel	Rangel
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Capuano	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez
Cardoza	(TX)	Ross
Carnahan	Jefferson	Rothman
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Castor	Jones (OH)	Rush
Chandler	Kagen	Ryan (OH)
Clarke	Kanjorski	Salazar
Clay	Kaptur	Sanchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kennedy	T.
Clyburn	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Kilpatrick	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kind	Schiff
Cooper	Klein (FL)	Schwartz
Costa	Kucinich	Scott (GA)
Costello	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lantos	Serrano
Cramer	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lee	Sherman
Cummings	Levin	Sires
Davis (AL)	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Davis, Lincoln	Lofgren, Zoe	Snyder
DeFazio	Lowe	Solis
DeGette	Lynch	Space
Delahunt	Mahoney (FL)	Spratt
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Dicks	Markey	Stupak
Dingell	Marshall	Sutton
Doggett	Matheson	Tanner
Donnelly	Matsui	Tauscher
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor
Edwards	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Ellsworth	McGovern	Tierney
Emanuel	McIntyre	Towns
Engel	McNerney	Udall (CO)
Eshoo	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Fattah	Melancon	Visclosky
Filner	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Giffords	Miller, George	Schultz
Gillibrand	Mitchell	Waters
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Watson
Gordon	Moore (KS)	Watt
Green, Al	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Green, Gene	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Grijalva	Murphy (CT)	Welch (VT)
Gutierrez	Murphy, Patrick	Wexler
Hall (NY)	Murtha	Wilson (OH)
Hare	Nadler	Woolsey
Harman	Napolitano	Wu
Hastings (FL)	Neal (MA)	Wynn
Herseth Sandlin	Oberstar	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Abercrombie	Hinojosa	Poe
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Sarbanes
Forbes	McNulty	Sessions
Hastert	Ortiz	

□ 1905

Mr. BOEHNER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 179, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

## YEAS—240

Ackerman	Grijalva	Obey
Allen	Gutierrez	Oliver
Andrews	Hall (NY)	Pallone
Arcuri	Hare	Pascarell
Baca	Harman	Pastor
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Baldwin	Hayes	Perlmutter
Barrow	Herseth Sandlin	Peterson (MN)
Bean	Higgins	Pomeroy
Becerra	Hill	Price (NC)
Berkley	Hinchey	Pryce (OH)
Berman	Hirono	Rahall
Berry	Hobson	Rangel
Bishop (GA)	Hodes	Regula
Bishop (NY)	Holden	Rehberg
Blumenauer	Holt	Reichert
Boren	Honda	Renzi
Boswell	Hooley	Reyes
Boucher	Hoyer	Rodriguez
Boyd (FL)	Inslee	Ross
Boyd (KS)	Israel	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Braley (IA)	Jackson-Lee	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Rush
Butterfield	Jefferson	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Jones (OH)	T.
Carnahan	Kagen	Sanchez, Loretta
Carney	Kanjorski	Schakowsky
Carson	Kaptur	Schiff
Castor	Kennedy	Schwartz
Chandler	Kildee	Scott (GA)
Clarke	Kilpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kind	Serrano
Cleaver	Kirk	Sestak
Clyburn	Klein (FL)	Shays
Cohen	Kucinich	Shea-Porter
Conyers	Langevin	Sherman
Cooper	Lantos	Shuler
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Skelton
Cramer	Latham	Slaughter
Crowley	Lee	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Levin	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Solis
Davis (CA)	Loeb	Space
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Spratt
Davis, Lincoln	Lowey	Stark
Davis, Tom	Lynch	Stupak
DeFazio	Mahoney (FL)	Sutton
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Tanner
Delahunt	Markey	Tauscher
DeLauro	Marshall	Taylor
Dicks	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Donnelly	McCollum (MN)	Towns
Doolittle	McDermott	Udall (CO)
Doyle	McGovern	Udall (NM)
Edwards	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Ellison	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellsworth	Meehan	Visclosky
Emanuel	Meek (FL)	Walsh (NY)
Emerson	Meeks (NY)	Walz (MN)
Engel	Melancon	Wasserman
English (PA)	Michaud	Schultz
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Waters
Etheridge	Miller, George	Watson
Farr	Mollohan	Watt
Fattah	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Filner	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Welch (VT)
Giffords	Murphy (CT)	Wexler
Gilchrest	Murphy, Patrick	Wilson (OH)
Gillibrand	Murtha	Wolf
Gonzalez	Nadler	Woolsey
Gordon	Napolitano	Wu
Green, Al	Neal (MA)	Wynn
Green, Gene	Oberstar	Yarmuth

## NAYS—179

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Akin	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Alexander	Blunt	Buyer
Altmire	Boehner	Calvert
Bachmann	Bonner	Camp (MI)
Bachus	Bono	Campbell (CA)
Baker	Boozman	Cannon
Barrett (SC)	Boustany	Cantor
Bartlett (MD)	Brady (TX)	Capito
Barton (TX)	Brown (SC)	Carter
Biggert	Brown-Waite,	Castle
Bilbray	Ginny	Chabot
Bilirakis	Buchanan	Coble

Cole (OK)	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Conaway	Jones (NC)	Platts
Costello	Jordan	Porter
Crenshaw	Keller	Price (GA)
Cubin	King (IA)	Putnam
Culberson	King (NY)	Radanovich
Davis (KY)	Kingston	Ramstad
Davis, David	Kline (MN)	Reynolds
Deal (GA)	Knollenberg	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lampson	Rohrabacher
Drake	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Roskam
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Ehlers	Linder	Ryan (WI)
Everett	LoBiondo	Sali
Fallin	Lucas	Saxton
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Schmidt
Ferguson	E.	Sensenbrenner
Flake	Mack	Shadegg
Fortenberry	Manzullo	Shimkus
Fossella	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster
Fox	McCauley (TX)	Simpson
Franks (AZ)	McCotter	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Smith (TX)
Galleghy	McHenry	Souder
Garrett (NJ)	McHugh	Stearns
Gerlach	McKeon	Sullivan
Gillmor	McMorris	Tancredo
Gingrey	Rodgers	Terry
Gohmert	Mica	Thornberry
Goode	Miller (FL)	Tiahrt
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Granger	Miller, Gary	Turner
Graves	Mitchell	Upton
Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)	Walberg
Hastings (WA)	Murphy, Tim	Walden (OR)
Heller	Musgrave	Wamp
Hensarling	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Herger	Neugebauer	Weller
Hoekstra	Nunes	Westmoreland
Hulshof	Paul	Wicker
Hunter	Pearce	Wilson (NM)
Inglis (SC)	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Peterson (PA)	Young (AK)
Jindal	Petri	Young (FL)
Johnson (IL)	Pickering	

## NOT VOTING—13

Abercrombie	LaHood	Sarbanes
Davis, Jo Ann	Marchant	Sessions
Forbes	McNulty	Whitfield
Hastert	Ortiz	
Hinojosa	Poe	

□ 1911

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 106

Mr. WICKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 106.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2740

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2740.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, MONDAY, JULY 9, 2007, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2900, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2007

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce have until midnight on July 9, 2007, to file a report to accompany H.R. 2900.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO  
MONDAY, JULY 2, 2007

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today on a motion offered pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, July 2, 2007, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 179, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR  
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON  
WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 2007

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 11, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

IN MEMORY OF HANNAH CONGDON, BAILEY GOODMAN, MEREDITH MCCLURE, SARA MONNAT AND KATHERINE SHIRLEY

(Mr. KUHLMAN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, we have been doing some serious work here. While the Members are departing for a district work period, I want to inform the rest of the House that 2 nights ago, a horrible accident happened in my district, in Canandaigua, New York, that took the lives of five young women from Fairport who were on their way to spend time on Keuka Lake, which is where I live.

All five of these young women were cheerleaders at Fairport High School and had just graduated from high school a week ago. They were all looking forward to a bright, fun summer together on the lake with friends, four of

whom were riding in a car behind them and were, thankfully, uninjured.

Madam Speaker, I am here to mourn the loss of Hannah Congdon. Hannah was known by friends as "constant sunshine." She never said a negative word about anyone and was always smiling.

Bailey Goodman. The girls were headed to Bailey's family cottage on Keuka Lake. Bailey was the team's entertainment, according to her friends, and could always make her teammates laugh.

Meredith McClure. Meredith was known as the team's hardest worker, always the first one to try a new jump or a stunt.

Sara Monnat. Sara was jokingly referred to as the team "boss." She would motivate and encourage her team in an amiable way, and was a born leader.

And Katherine Shirley. Katie loved her friends. She would spend hours putting together scrapbooks and surrounding herself with photos of her and her friends.

I offer my prayers and condolences to the families, friends and neighbors of these beautiful young women who were so violently taken from us.

I also rise, Madam Speaker, to ask that the House pause for a moment of silence in remembrance of Bailey, Hannah, Katie, Sara and Meredith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and the House will observe a moment of silence.

□ 1915

#### COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ROBERT A. BRADY, Chairman, Committee on House Administration:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 28, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 801(b) of Public Law 101-696 (2 U.S.C. 2081(b)), the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library serve ex officio on the U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission, but each may designate another Member to serve in his or her place.

As Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee for the 110th Congress, I am designating Representative Michael E. Capuano of Massachusetts to serve on the U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission in lieu of myself in my role as Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, as provided for in Section 801(c) of Public Law 101-696 (2 U.S.C. 2081(c)).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BRADY,  
Vice Chairman,  
Joint Committee on the Library.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. C.A. "DUTCH" RUPPERSBERGER AND HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JULY 10, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 28, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER and the Honorable ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through July 10, 2007.

NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 26, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to H. Res. 496, I was elected to the Energy and Commerce Committee on June 19, 2007, to fill the vacancy created by a Member's temporary absence. That Member's temporary absence is over and the Member is able to reclaim his seat. Therefore, I hereby resign from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, effective immediately.

This resignation does not affect my own status of being on leave from the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I will retain my seniority upon returning to the Committee.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

PAUL E. GILLMOR,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged message from the Senate:

In the Senate of the United States, June 27, 2007.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1612) entitled "An Act to amend the penalty provisions in the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, and for other purposes.", and that upon the compliance of the request, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make corrections in the engrossment of the aforesaid bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senate is agreed to, and S. 1612 will be returned to the Senate.

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 28, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with an administrative subpoena for documents issued by the Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Education.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. BEARD,  
Chief Administrative Officer.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill and a Concurrent Resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1830. An act to extend the authorities of the Andean Trade Preference Act until February 29, 2008.

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent Resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

#### HONORING MATTHEW ALEXANDER OF GRETNA, NEBRASKA

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, Corporal Matthew Alexander of Gretna, Nebraska, died in Baqubah, Iraq, on May 6, when a improvised explosive device detonated near his military vehicle. He was 21 years old.

Matthew and his wife, Kara, wed on Valentine's Day of this year. Upon his death, Kara said, "Matthew made it his life's work to take care of those he loved. His heart was made of gold. Matt truly was our angel on Earth," she said.

Corporal Alexander was the son of Melvin and Monica Alexander of, Gretna, and the brother of Marshall.

As a young teen, he made clear his intent to serve others in the United States military. At his funeral, in a tremendous outpouring of support from the community, friends and neighbors gave testimony to his kindness and compassion, his dedication to the least among us.

His life and his death are marked by noble virtue. America is forever indebted to corporal Matthew Alexander.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## VICE PRESIDENT SHOULD RESIGN OR FACE IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, it is time for a new exit strategy, one that removes the Vice President of the United States from office, voluntarily, if he chooses, but by impeachment if he stonewalls.

The time has come for the Vice President to go. Our Nation and our national security interests at home and abroad cannot afford to have this Vice President one heartbeat away from the Presidency. As it stands now, the Vice President's damage to U.S. interests, security, system of government and our position at home and abroad will take years to overcome.

As my constituents in the State of Washington's Seventh Congressional District know, I have struggled mightily with this matter for a long time. In grave matters facing our Nation, I believe conscience and a deep respect for our system of government should guide our actions and words.

I didn't hesitate to speak the truth to power before the invasion of Iraq, despite the bitter partisan acts that I knew would follow. I have no doubt that I will be targeted for a new round of shelling after these remarks.

The intent of this administration and this Vice President has been to silence all dissent, and it always happens the same way; relentless attacks until people ask themselves, do I want to subject myself to that kind of hell if I speak out? Fear is what kept this administration in office in 2004, and fear is the only public discourse this administration understands and practices. Why debate, when you can dictate? Why follow the law, when you can act like you are above the law?

For months, I believed that impeachment was a dire course of action. Over these same months, I have seen the haven't repeatedly drive our Nation into increasingly dire situations in Iraq, Iran and within our country as he tramples on the Constitution like it was a doormat.

For months I have considered if America would best be served by bring-

ing forth articles of impeachment against the Vice President. I kept asking myself, is the Vice President's conduct that dire, because impeachment is the closest thing there is to internment on political death row.

The Founders intended impeachment to be used when those running the government forgot that they worked for the people, and the Founders intended impeachment to be used when toughs running the government acted as though they were above the law.

When you look at the record, you have to conclude that the Vice President has placed himself above the law. He holds himself accountable only to special interests, who meet with him in secret with no record kept of who was there, what was discussed or what promises the Vice President made.

For the last 4 years, the Vice President has refused to allow routine office inspections by a Federal agency regarding the safe handling of America's secrets. The Vice President defies the Information Security Oversight Agency, claiming he is not part of the executive branch of government. When a sitting Vice President claims that he is not part of the executive branch of government to which he was elected, it is time to remove him.

The Vice President holds himself accountable to no one. He ordered the Secret Service to destroy visitors logs, and we have learned in the Washington Post recently, that the Vice President circumvented every check and balance inside the White House to force through his own agenda, to spy on Americans through illegal wire traps, creating the gulag at Guantanamo, and subverting civil liberties and free speech at every turn.

Since the President permits the flagrant disregard of the Constitution, it is up to the Congress to act and defend the American people. With each new revelation, America has seen only glints of what has been done totally in secret.

For all we don't know, this much we do know: The Vice President holds himself above the law, and it is time for the Congress to enforce the law. I believe the evidence is overwhelming and the articles of impeachment against the Vice President should be drawn up.

The Vice President likes to say the military option is on the table. Tonight it is time to say the impeachment option is on the table.

I am adding my name to H.R. 333, calling for the impeachment. For the good of the Nation, the Vice President should leave office immediately. Call it a medical condition, call it a political condition, call it what it is; the departure of a person who forgot that he works for the American people.

The Vice President must either resign or face impeachment.

Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an article in Slate magazine dated 27 June 2004, entitled "Impeach CHENEY."

[From Slate.com, June 27, 2007]

IMPEACH CHENEY—THE VICE PRESIDENT HAS RUN UTTERLY AMOK AND MUST BE STOPPED

(By Bruce Fein)

Under Dick Cheney, the office of the vice president has been transformed from a tiny acorn into an unprecedented giant oak. In grasping and exercising presidential powers, Cheney has dulled political accountability and concocted theories for evading the law and Constitution that would have embarrassed King George III. The most recent invention we know of is the vice president's insistence that an executive order governing the handling of classified information in the executive branch does not reach his office because he also serves as president of the Senate. In other words, the vice president is a unique legislative-executive creature standing above and beyond the Constitution. The House Judiciary Committee should commence an impeachment inquiry. As Alexander Hamilton advised in the Federalist Papers, an impeachable offense is a political crime against the nation. Cheney's multiple crimes against the Constitution clearly qualify.

Take the vice president's preposterous theory that his office is outside the executive branch because it also exercises a legislative function. The same can be said of the president, who also exercises a legislative function in signing or vetoing bills passed by Congress. Under Cheney's bizarre reasoning, President Bush is not part of his own administration: The executive branch becomes acephalous. Today Cheney Chief of Staff David Addington refused to renounce that reasoning, instead laughably trying to diminish the importance of the legal question at issue.

The nation's first vice president, John Adams, bemoaned: "My country has in its wisdom contrived for me the most insignificant office that ever the invention of man contrived or his imagination conceived; and as I can do neither good nor evil, I must be borne away by others and meet common fate." Vice President John Nance Garner, serving under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, lamented: "The vice presidency isn't worth a pitcher of warm \* \* \*." In modern times, vice presidents have generally been confined to attending state funerals or to distributing blankets after earthquakes.

Then President George W. Bush outsourced the lion's share of his presidency to Vice President Cheney, and Mr. Cheney has made the most of it. Since 9/11, he has proclaimed that all checks and balances and individual liberties are subservient to the president's commander in chief powers in confronting international terrorism. Let's review the record of his abuses and excesses:

The vice president asserted presidential power to create military commissions, which combine the functions of judge, jury, and prosecutor in the trial of war crimes. The Supreme Court rebuked Cheney in *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*. Mr. Cheney claimed authority to detain American citizens as enemy combatants indefinitely at Guantanamo Bay on the president's say-so alone, a frightening power indistinguishable from King Louis XVI's execrated lettres de cachet that occasioned the storming of the Bastille. The Supreme Court repudiated Cheney in *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*.

The vice president initiated kidnappings, secret detentions, and torture in Eastern European prisons of suspected international terrorists. This lawlessness has been answered in Germany and Italy with criminal charges against CIA operatives or agents. The legal precedent set by Cheney would justify a decision by Russian President Vladimir Putin to kidnap American tourists in

Paris and to dispatch them to dungeons in Belarus if they were suspected of Chechen sympathies.

The vice president has maintained that the entire world is a battlefield. Accordingly, he contends that military power may be unleashed to kill or capture any American citizen on American soil if suspected of association or affiliation with al-Qaida. Thus, Mr. Cheney could have ordered the military to kill Jose Padilla with rockets, artillery, or otherwise when he landed at O'Hare Airport in Chicago, because of Padilla's then-suspected ties to international terrorism.

Mr. Cheney has championed a presidential power to torture in contravention of federal statutes and treaties.

He has advocated and authored signing statements that declare the president's intent to disregard provisions of bills he has signed into law that he proclaims are unconstitutional, for example, a requirement to obtain a judicial warrant before opening mail or a prohibition on employing military force to fight narco-terrorists in Colombia. The signing statements are tantamount to absolute line-item vetoes that the Supreme Court invalidated in the 1998 case *Clinton v. New York*.

The vice president engineered the National Security Agency's warrantless domestic surveillance program targeting American citizens on American soil in contravention of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. He concocted the alarming theory that the president may flout any law that inhibits the collection of foreign intelligence, including prohibitions on breaking and entering homes, torture, or assassinations. As a reflection of his power in this arena, today the Senate Judiciary Committee subpoenaed Cheney's office, as well as the White House, for documents that relate to the warrantless eavesdropping.

The vice president has orchestrated the invocation of executive privilege to conceal from Congress secret spying programs to gather foreign intelligence, and their legal justifications. He has summoned the privilege to refuse to disclose his consulting of business executives in conjunction with his Energy Task Force, and to frustrate the testimonies of Karl Rove and Harriet Miers regarding the firings of U.S. attorneys.

Cheney scorns freedom of speech and of the press. He urges application of the Espionage Act to prosecute journalists who expose national security abuses, for example, secret prisons in Eastern Europe or the NSA's warrantless surveillance program. He retaliated against Ambassador Joseph Wilson and his wife, Valerie Plame, through Chief of Staff Scooter Libby, for questioning the administration's evidence of weapons of mass destruction as justification for invading Iraq. Mr. Cheney is defending himself from a pending suit brought by Wilson and Plame on the grounds that he is entitled to the absolute immunity of the president established in 1982 by *Nixon v. Fitzgerald*. (Although this defense contradicts Cheney's claim that he is not part of the executive branch.)

The Constitution does not expressly forbid the president from abandoning his chief powers to the vice president. But President Bush's tacit delegation to Cheney and Cheney's eager acceptance tortures the Constitution's provision for an acting president. The presidency and vice presidency are discrete constitutional offices. The 12th Amendment provides for their separate elections. The sole constitutionally enumerated function of the vice president is to serve as president of the Senate without a vote except to break ties.

In contrast, Article II enumerates the powers and responsibilities of the president, including the obligation to take care that the

laws be faithfully executed. A special presidential oath is prescribed. Section 3 of the 25th Amendment provides a method for the president to yield his office to the vice president, when "he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office." There is no other constitutional provision for transferring presidential powers to the vice president.

Yet without making a written transmittal to Congress, President Bush has ceded vast domains of his powers to Vice President Cheney by mutual understanding that circumvents the 25th Amendment. This constitutional provision assures that the public and Congress know who is exercising the powers of the presidency and who should be held responsible for successes or failures. The Bush-Cheney dispensation blurs political accountability by continually hiding the real decision-maker under presidential skirts. The Washington Post has thoroughly documented the vice president's dominance in a four-part series running this week. It is quite a read.

In the end, President Bush regularly is unable to explain or defend the policies of his own administration, and that is because the heavy intellectual labor has been performed in the office of the vice president. Cheney is impeachable for his overweening power and his sneering contempt of the Constitution and the rule of law.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the Vice President.

□ 1930

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### WELCOME BACK SIMMONS COLLEGE OF KENTUCKY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of one of the most storied institutions in Louisville's rich history on this day of its rebirth as an independent liberal arts institution, as it was intended.

Shortly after the end of the Civil War, 12 forward-thinking former slaves gathered in Louisville, united by the understanding that education would be key to prosperity as free people in America. The institution of higher learning that opened its door 14 years later in 1879 was unique in its commitment to African American education.

While many similar institutions were the result of the efforts of white missionaries working to give recently freed people the advantages of American society, Simmons, known at that time as the Kentucky Normal Theological Institute in Louisville, was created in a collaboration that bridged the racial divide. Black Baptists and white Baptists, recently freed and those born of privilege, worked hand in hand in pursuit of equality in education.

Early leaders at the school came with impressive Ivy League pedigrees, but as the strength of the institution increased, they turned more and more to alumni that came from within. By the early part of the 20th century, it was difficult to find a finer education than that offered at Simmons College, earning it the nickname: "The Black Harvard of the South."

Within four decades of its inception and a half century removed from slavery, Simmons embodied the dream and exceeded the expectations of the dozen visionaries who foresaw education as the tools for equality. Louisville's Simmons College was a liberal arts college of national renown.

But like so many others, the economic hardships of the Great Depression devastated the school. The properties succumbed to foreclosure and the institution lost its independence. Despite meeting tremendous adversity, the determination that led Simmons' inception and incredible ascent drove its journey onward.

For decades and under several names, the school continued to exist. Most recently, the school specialized in theology, expertly training pastors at Simmons Bible College at 18th Street and Dumesnil.

But, Dr. Kevin W. Cosby, the latest in a great tradition of Simmons leadership dating back to Elijah Marrs, William Simmons, and Charles Parish, has led the way to a full restoration of



Simmons' early success as, in his words, "the mother of black higher education in the State of Kentucky." Through his work as president of the school and as pastor at St. Stephen Baptist Church, Dr. Cosby has worked to expand the school to its original home at 7th Street and Kentucky, where, in conjunction with the current campus, it will once again operate as a fully independent liberal arts university.

In this capacity, Simmons will again offer students from around the country a chance to realize their potential and excel, giving hope to those who need it. I applaud the vision and fortitude that Dr. Cosby has shown in restoring this indispensable treasure, which is not just a shining light in Kentucky's history, but to the Commonwealth's present and future as well.

I hope that it is Simmons, not recent decisions in Washington that could indicate a slow retreat from our strides in civil rights, that portends the course our Nation now treads. It is my great honor to stand on the House floor in recognition of the tremendous national significance and benefit of Simmons College of Kentucky and to say: Welcome back.

#### IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, President Bush finds himself increasingly isolated on the issue of Iraq. Public support continues to evaporate. This week in a devastating blow to the President's policy, Indiana Senator RICHARD LUGAR, ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, a respected voice and, I might say, a very experienced voice on foreign policy for the past 30 years, publicly broke with the Bush administration on Iraq.

In remarks on the Senate floor which are prominently featured on the home page of his Web site, Senator LUGAR said: "Our course in Iraq has lost contact with our vital national security interests in the Middle East and beyond. Our continuing absorption with military activities in Iraq is limiting our diplomatic assertiveness there and elsewhere in the world. The prospects that the current 'surge' strategy will succeed in the way originally envisioned by the President are very limited within the short period framed by our own domestic political debate. And the strident, polarized nature of that debate increases the risk that our involvement in Iraq will end in a poorly planned withdrawal that undercuts our vital interests in the Middle East. Unless we recalibrate our strategy in Iraq to fit our domestic political conditions and the broader needs of U.S. national security, we risk foreign policy failures that could greatly diminish our influence across that region and the world."

Senator LUGAR framed the debate in terms of U.S. interests in the Middle

East and the world. He is correct to note that: "The current surge strategy is not an effective means of protecting those interests. Its prospects for success are too dependent on the actions of others who do not share our agenda. It relies on military power to achieve goals that it cannot achieve. It distances allies that we will need for any regional diplomatic effort. Its failure, without a careful transition to a backup policy, would intensify our loss of credibility. It uses tremendous amounts of resources that cannot be employed in other ways to secure our objectives. And it lacks domestic support that is necessary to sustain a policy of this type."

I would add several other observations: Rising casualties signal a strategy that is not working.

The U.S. death toll has risen to over 3,555 and there are that many Iraqis dying every month. President Bush himself has admitted his surge will result in more American casualties, a phenomenon we in Ohio know well as last week we lost another airman, F-16 pilot Kevin Sonnenburg, who was laid to rest.

Madam Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD other important information about the situation in Iraq. Flexibility is not the President's strong suit, and it is time for President Bush to get in touch with reality before he does more damage to the position of the United States in the Middle East and before we lose more of our sons and daughters and the nation of Iraq loses more of its sons and daughters.

Madam Speaker, President Bush finds himself increasingly isolated on the issue of Iraq. Public support continues to evaporate. This week, in a devastating blow to the President's policy, Senator RICHARD LUGAR, ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee and a respected voice on foreign policy for the past 30 years, publicly broke with the Bush Administration on Iraq.

In remarks on the Senate floor, which are prominently featured on the home page of his Web site, Senator LUGAR said:

... (O)ur course in Iraq has lost contact with our vital national security interests in the Middle East and beyond. Our continuing absorption with military activities in Iraq is limiting our diplomatic assertiveness there and elsewhere in the world. The prospects that the current "surge" strategy will succeed in the way originally envisioned by the President are very limited within the short period framed by our own domestic political debate. And the strident, polarized nature of that debate increases the risk that our involvement in Iraq will end in a poorly planned withdrawal that undercuts our vital interests in the Middle East. Unless we recalibrate our strategy in Iraq to fit our domestic political conditions and the broader needs of U.S. national security, we risk foreign policy failures that could greatly diminish our influence in the region and the world.

Senator LUGAR frames the debate in terms of U.S. interests in the Middle East and the world. He is correct to note that:

... (T)he current surge strategy is not an effective means of protecting these interests. Its prospects for success are too dependent

on the actions of others who do not share our agenda. It relies on military power to achieve goals that it cannot achieve. It distances allies that we will need for any regional diplomatic effort. Its failure, without a careful transition to a backup policy would intensify our loss of credibility. It uses tremendous amounts of resources that cannot be employed in other ways to secure our objectives. And it lacks domestic support that is necessary to sustain a policy of this type.

I would add several other observations:

RIISING CASUALTIES SIGNAL A STRATEGY THAT IS NOT WORKING

When a U.S. soldier was killed recently by a roadside bomb in the southwestern section of Baghdad, the death toll for American service personnel reached 3,500 over the four years of this war.

The U.S. death toll has risen over 3555.

President Bush himself admitted his "surge" will result in more American casualties—a phenomenon that has become all too frequent as a result of the Administration's conduct of the war. Even now, Northwest Ohio is mourning the loss of an F-16 pilot from the 180th Fighter Wing out of Toledo.

We stand foursquare behind our troops. We will support them in every possible way.

Sooner or later, President Bush has to face the facts: the American people will not sacrifice their sons and daughters in a failed strategy.

SOLDIERS BECOMING INCREASINGLY DISILLUSIONED

Our armed forces are being stretched too thin, but the White House just won't listen. Senator LUGAR said in his speech: "The window during which we can continue to employ American troops in Iraqi neighborhoods without damaging our military strength or our ability to respond to other national security priorities is closing."

Tour after tour in Iraq are taxing the best troops in the world, our American soldiers, leaving them increasingly disillusioned with the mission.

Soldiers are home no longer than 24 hours before they receive a phone call telling them to change their plans because they are going back to Iraq.

Our troops have stepped up to the plate, they have served with honor, and now it is time for their Iraqi counterparts to step up.

Our unit has already sent two soldiers in a box. My soldiers don't see the same level of commitment from the Iraqi Army units they're partnered with.—Captain Douglas Rogers of Delta Company.

Meanwhile, the line between ally and foe is continuing to be blurred as soldiers watch shadowy militia commanders installed as Iraqi Army officers, which places all our forces in a vulnerable position, heavily susceptible to internal as well as external terrorist attacks.

THE WAR IS CAUSING NEUROPSYCHIATRIC ILLNESS AMONG OUR TROOPS

The war in Iraq is taking a hidden toll on the American forces:

38 percent of soldiers, 31 percent of our Marines, 49 percent of our Army National Guard and 43 percent of our Marine reservists have reported symptoms of neuropsychiatric illnesses—PTSD, anxiety, depression.

Mental health care stigma remains pervasive and is a significant barrier to care.

Mental health professionals are not sufficiently accessible to service members and their families.

There are significant gaps in the continuum of care for psychological health.



The military system does not have enough resources, funding or personnel to adequately support the neuropsychological health of service members and their families in peace and during conflict.

There is a shortage of active-duty mental health professionals. The system has been stressed by repeated deployments and other frustrations, and psychologists and psychiatric nurses are leaving the military in growing numbers:

Air Force lost 20 percent of mental health workers from 2003–2007.

Navy lost 15 percent of mental health workers from 2003–2006.

Army lost 8 percent of mental health workers from 2003–2005.

This report points to significant shortfalls in achieving goals and taking care of our service members and their families.—Dr. S. Ward Casscells, assistant secretary of defense for health affairs

The current complement of mental health professionals is woefully inadequate.—MHTF Report.

#### CONCLUSION

Madam Speaker, flexibility is not President Bush's strong suit.

As his policy in Iraq continued to unravel, he dug his heels in and refused to listen to the generals, to the Congress or to the American people.

As the situation in Iraq continued to deteriorate, the President kept insisting that things were getting better and the violence was beginning to subside.

As civil society devolved into chaos, President Bush held onto the false hope that the Iraqi people were somehow prepared to take the necessary steps toward creating a democracy.

Madam Speaker, President Bush cannot sustain this charade any longer.

The "wise men" of the Republican Party, including Senator LUGAR, are calling into question the fundamental precepts of the Bush policy and calling for a major overhaul.

The president's Iraq policy stands discredited in the eyes of the world. At this point, only President Bush, Vice President CHENEY and Prime Minister Tony Blair seem to believe that the original mission has any chance of success.

It is time, Madam Speaker, for President Bush to get in touch with reality before he does anymore damage to the position of the United States in the Middle East and before we lose in the Middle East even more of our sons and daughters in this disastrous war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. REICHERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SARBANES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ELLISON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DIPLOMATIC STRATEGY FOR IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak for a few minutes about Iraq. Every Member of the House brings their experience with them. Mine happens to be 31 years in the military, including leading men and women in war. I have operated with the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, entered the DMZ in North Korea, dealt with the Iranians at sea in the Persian Gulf.

When I saw us about to go into Iraq, I was concerned. I felt it was a tragic misadventure, not because of Iraq solely by itself, but because of what it would do to our strategic security around this globe.

I flew with my battle group over Iraq just prior to the war, after having left the war in Afghanistan. I have always been taken in the military by the power of our diplomacy, the power of our diplomats, because they are the ones who often have prevented us from having to use our military. I honestly believe there is a way to redeploy from Iraq that does not mean just getting out nor just bringing the troops home. Those are the wrong words.

Iraq is a set piece in a strategic environment around this world that the United States has interest in. And there is a way to end this tragic misadventure, to redeploy out of Iraq so we might place our men and women where they need to be in Afghanistan, the western Pacific, and here at home to improve the readiness of our Army that has not one, not one active Guard or Reserve unit that is in a state of readiness to deploy anywhere to any other contingency in this world.

And that strategy is really brought about by changing the behavior, in particular, of Iran, who I have operated with at sea, and Iraq and Syria, and the other nations in that region. We will not do that by doubling down once again on a bad bet with a surge of military forces. I know. I have watched it happen before.

This can only be resolved by a strategy that sets a date, a date within a year by which we will redeploy out of Iraq, because that date is not just for ending this war, it has the value of a different strategy to leave an unfailed state, as Iran, recognizing that we will no longer be in that state, but we will remain in the region at our bases that we do have in Qatar, Oman, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates; and our carrier battle group and our amphibious ready group in that region because we have interests there.

But by that date we change the behavior of Iran who does not want to deal by itself with the 2 million Iraqis who have been dislocated from their homes and have yet to overflow their borders, as 2 million others have.

And Syria, that is Sunni, does not want as it fuels, after we leave there, a civil war, would be fueling the Sunnis against the Shia that the Iranians might be supporting. Neither nation wants a proxy war.

If we work diplomatically with a date certain, because they don't want us to remain in that nation, we have the ability to bring to the table the interested parties who can work on the extreme elements in that nation, Iran and Syria; and we deal with the center, the government of Baghdad, with a date certain that makes them recognize they must also step up to the plate and assume responsibility for the country which they have done and presently have to do as we keep a lid politically and militarily on a simmering pot.

There is a strategy which I believe we need to pursue, Republican and Democrat together, that sets a date of approximately a year, which gives us time to safely redeploy. Because, remember, it took us 6 months to redeploy out of Somalia with only about 8,000 troops, when we have 160,000 in Iraq with over 100,000 U.S. contractors. We need time to safely redeploy with a strategy that works to bring Iran and Syria to the table because they have interests in accommodating stability as we remain in that region because of our interests, providing air cover if necessary from above, from bases outside or Special Forces from outside, as we begin to address our other security interests around the world and here at home.

□ 1945

#### STAND DOWN 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, we are all concerned about the troops. I am extremely concerned about the troops when they return home.

On this past Saturday, June 23, I visited the 14th annual Kansas City Stand Down. This is a 2-day event, and it opened up in Kansas City on Truman Road, the road that Harry Truman's

house sits on. It was open to homeless veterans. It provided a variety of services. This event is an opportunity for Americans to help Americans, Americans giving respect and dignity to their veterans who are down on their luck and in many cases homeless.

It is believed there are approximately 1,800 homeless veterans in Kansas City, Missouri's largest city. This year 800 homeless veterans attended the Stand Down and received assistance from 500 volunteers. It was a wonderful opportunity to meet and visit with veterans who proudly served the United States of America, and I want to also say at this time it was a proud opportunity for me to thank the volunteers who forfeited their time to make a difference.

One of the most popular contributors was Big Bubba's Barbecue, who fed a delicious barbecue lunch to over 700 people on Saturday. Grants were provided by Best Buy, At Home America, and the U.S. Department of Labor. These grants, combined with donations and countless volunteer hours, ensured that the Stand Down would be able to provide the necessary assistance to our homeless veterans.

When a homeless veteran arrives, they know that they will be greeted with respect and provided with shelter, shoes, showers, haircuts, blankets, clothing and hygiene products. Each veteran is given medical health screenings, eye care, dental care and if the veteran does not have identification, they are provided with a picture ID, assistance with legal problems, VA benefit counseling, general benefits counseling, including Social Security, food stamps, local health and human services, substance abuse counseling, mental health counseling, employment services which include job referrals, employment counseling, as well as housing services.

I wish the entire Nation could have seen Kansas City turn out to pay respect to their veterans and to provide them with care. I truly appreciate and congratulate the Vet Center, AmeriCorps Vista volunteers and the Stand Down steering committee for a job well done. If this is done all over America the way it was done in the Fifth District of Missouri, our veterans will know that we really do care.

#### HOUSE DEMOCRATS' TOP 100 BROKEN PROMISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this and I appreciate the minority leader asking me to lead this hour tonight.

I am going to have next to me here a little poster that I'm going to keep up during my talk. I am joined by a couple of my colleagues that I will recognize

in just a few minutes. I have been blessed to be a part of an organization and a group that has come here on the House floor in the last 18 months or so called the Truth Squad, led very ably by our colleague, Dr. PRICE from Georgia. I think that we will add to our Truth Squad on a regular basis the group that will be talking about the House Democrats' Top 100 Broken Promises.

Last fall, the Democrats won a majority in this Congress, in the House and in the Senate, by making many promises to the American people. They have not kept these promises. At the beginning of the 110th Congress, the new majority came to power full of promises for a bipartisan working relationship and a landmark pledge to create "the most honest, most open and most ethical Congress in history." Unfortunately, the first 6 months of Democratic control have been marked by a long string of broken promises. Contrary to the pledges they made to the American people, the leaders of the current majority have delivered a more closed, intellectually dishonest, and ethically ambivalent House of Representatives. By decree instead of open debate, Democrats have attempted to weaken our national defense and legislate retreat from the global war on terror, impose the largest tax increase in American history, propose the most indiscriminate wasteful spending this Congress has seen in decades, craft multi-billion dollar slush funds for secret earmarks, make gas prices worse by raising taxes and increasing regulation, and cut Medicare at a time when our seniors are enjoying large savings in their prescription drug medicines. This is the wrong direction for the American people.

I am quoting from a new report that the offices of the Republican leaders have put together and will continue to do that throughout my comments tonight.

At the 6-month mark of the new majority, the report takes a look at the House Democrats' top 100 promises and how those broken promises have led to little if any accomplishments of note and a record of failure that has undermined the confidence of the American people in this Congress. As I said earlier, this report complements efforts that have been made by other House Republicans, including the Official Truth Squad, and the Truth Squad has been holding Democrats accountable for their promises. We're going to go over these promises one by one, point them out to the American people and show them what has not happened even though the Democrats made these promises in order to get elected last fall.

Let me start with Democratic Promise No. 1: Prepared to Govern and Ready to Lead: "Democrats are prepared to govern and ready to lead." Speaker-Elect NANCY PELOSI, D-CA, in a press release, November 8, 2006.

Now, let me tell you what the report is on that promise from the Chicago

Tribune. The headline on the article, "Democrats Promised Way More Than They've Delivered So Far." June 21, 2007. And this is the quote from that article: "Six months after taking over Congress, Democrats find they have accomplished little of their agenda. Perhaps not coincidentally, Congress's job approval rating has reached a dramatic low. If they can't reverse the trend, some Democrats are starting to worry their majority could be short-lived."

Well, for the benefit of the American people who counted on the promises that the Democrats made and who promised a new bipartisan approach to governing, and with our assistance we could have accomplished a great deal in this 6 months, but because they have refused to uphold their promises, they have not been able to fulfill much, if anything.

I would now like to recognize one of my colleagues who's here with us tonight who's going to expand upon some of these promises and talk a little bit about how they have affected the American people and perhaps particularly those in her district, the gentlelady from Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina.

I think Americans are disappointed. I think with the change in leadership in the House of Representatives as well as in the Senate, the people thought things were going to be improved. Kind of like when you buy a new container of detergent, it might say New and Improved. Well, I have to say, it's not improved and it certainly isn't new.

We were promised transparency. As you know, the gentlelady from North Carolina, if you recall, we had some language about making all earmarks transparent when we were in charge, when the Republicans were in charge. Well, a week and a half ago on this very floor, we found out that that promise of transparency was broken and the promise of transparency in earmarks just didn't happen. As a matter of fact, we were going to be asked to vote on a bill that we had no idea what the earmarks were going to be in. We would be told that when it came back from conference.

Well, that clearly, as my momma used to say, was buying a pig in a poke. You didn't know what you were getting and it was a very bad public policy. One of the Democrat promises was that they were going to promote smart and tough security. Let me read a direct quote: "Democrats are committed to protecting our country with real security initiatives that are smart and tough," then Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI said in a press release on October 25, 2006, before the November elections.

Well, what we find is that the Democrats brought legislation to the House floor supporting the transfer of responsibility for a critical national security program to, of all entities, the United

Nations. And then 230 Democrats voted against a Republican motion to recommit which would have prohibited this transfer of responsibility and made clear that America's national security is and should be the responsibility of America alone. That happened to be a vote on January 4 of 2007.

In the Fifth Congressional District in Florida, which I represent, and I know, Ms. FOXX, in your district, too, protecting of our borders is so important. Let me read a quote from then Minority Whip STENY HOYER. The quote was made November 25, 2006: "I believe there is virtually unanimous agreement in the Congress that we must secure our borders and know who is entering our country."

Contrast that with May of 2006, and then what we have is a total change on June 15, 2007, when, just 6 months after the Democrats took power in the House, 214 Democrats voted against a Republican proposal to provide funds necessary for the construction of at least two layers of reinforced fencing, the installation of additional and physical barriers, road lighting, cameras and sensors, so that we could make our borders secure. This certainly is not the secure U.S. border promise that was made before the election.

The Fifth Congressional District has a large number of retirees in it and people who are relying on Social Security. They truly care about the future of our country and the absolute need to be very careful about protecting future generations.

Let me read a quote that was made and that is that they were going to reform entitlement spending to protect future generations. But here's where the broken promise came in. The Democrat budget actually puts off tough and divisive decisions. Democrats did not include proposals to control the growth of entitlement programs that are projected to swamp the rest of the budget. Again, another broken promise.

While you have a list there of 100 broken promises, whether it's the transparency issue or whether it is reforming entitlement spending, or let me end with one that is so important to my district and that is Social Security and the Social Security trust fund. I would like to read a quote, and this was in March 2007 by a member of the Democrat Party from New Jersey. He said, "We will not borrow the money from the Social Security trust fund and from other creditors around the world."

However, when there was a Republican proposal to prohibit increases in the authorization spending levels if the Social Security surplus has been spent the previous year, that same Member from New Jersey voted to virtually break his promise. That's what Americans are concerned about. That's exactly why the rating of Congress is down to 14. I think it's a combination of thus far the very, very serious broken promises and what the Senate was about to do on immigration.

□ 2000

Americans are very disappointed, and I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for bringing this issue to the House floor. It's important that we remind the citizens, Republicans, Democrats and Independents of the broken promises that have only happened the first 6 months of the Democrat control of this House.

I thank the gentlelady for bringing this very important issue up.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Florida, who also represents a fifth district, as I represent the Fifth District in North Carolina. We share our names together and the districts that we represent, and our respective States together.

I am going to speak a little bit more from this report, and then I am going to recognize one of my colleagues from Texas. I think it's important to sort of set the stage again for these comments. I am very grateful to my two colleagues for being with me tonight.

Democratic Promise No. 2, now, as my colleague from Florida said, there are a lot more than 100 of these promises. We have taken the Top 100. Between now and the next 6 months, we know there are going to be a lot more than that, but we only have time to deal with the first 100.

But this was Democratic Promise No. 2 that I want to highlight, "We will make this the most honest, ethical and open Congress in history," Speaker-elect NANCY PELOSI, press conference, November 8, 2006.

Broken promises, this is a quote from the Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial, June 10, 2007, entitled, "A Wake-Up Call for Congress. When Democrats recaptured the House last November after 12 years of the minority, they promised voters 'the most honest, the most open and most ethical Congress.' Five months after Nancy Pelosi and her leadership took control, that promise remains unfulfilled."

With so little in the way of accomplishments, is it any wonder that a new poll released by Gallup last week showed that just 14 percent of Americans have confidence in this Congress, an all-time low. The previous low point for Congress was 18 percent at several points in the time period from 1991 to 1994, the last time Democrats were in power.

Indeed, one of the only meaningful accomplishments of this Congress to date has been legislation enacted to fully fund American troops fighting the war on terror, a bill that was carried on the strength of a unified Republican Party. Nearly half of the 39 bills signed into law either named Federal property or billed a road.

In sharp contrast, Republicans have spoken with one voice and kept our promise made to the American people 6 months ago to return to our core principles and focus on a smaller, less costly, accountable government. Moreover, a unified Republican Conference has proven formidable, effective and suc-

cessful in exposing flaws and strengthening Democratic legislation by passing 14 GOP motions to recommit in just 6 months, more than House Democrats were able to accomplish in their 12-year stint in the minority.

In many ways, the new Democratic majority has simply picked up where the old Democratic majority left off, a long list of broken promises, little in the way of accomplishments, and dangerously disconnected from the American people.

I came to Congress because I wanted to make changes in a positive way and represent the people of my district and the country in a very, very positive way. I think most Members came here for that. It troubles me to see an approval rating of only 14 percent. That is not good for this institution; it is not good for this country.

I want us to be able to revive the attitude of the American people toward the Congress. That is why we are holding up these promises that the Democrats have made and not fulfilled that let people know the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans in this body.

I would now like to recognize my good colleague from the State of Texas (Mr. CARTER), who is going to share some more insights into these broken promises.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend and colleague from North Carolina.

This is an interesting document that we have got here. I have got a copy, certainly a smaller version than is on the board there. These Top 100 broken promises, I thought it would just be interesting to just thumb through here and turn to a page and see if we can find one that we might find interesting.

I am just going to randomly look here. Let's see, energy policy, Energy Independence Day.

Promise: "We will make this 4th of July Energy Independence Day." That's coming up next week, I believe. That's from Speaker-elect NANCY PELOSI back on May 9, 2007, at a press conference. "The House energy bill has evolved into a heated internecine battle" that threatens to spoil Democrats' hope of passing an overall energy policy by July 4. "Pelosi versus Dingell Heats Up." "Energy Tension Rises At Meeting." Roll Call, one of our newspapers here on the Hill, June 13, 2007. "House Members will depart for the 4th of July district work period without passing independence energy legislation of any kind." That's a quick look through here.

Let's look over here at something else. "Eliminate Reliance on Foreign Oil," promise: "To free America from dependence on foreign oil, we will achieve energy independence for America by 2020 by eliminating reliance on oil from the Middle East and other unstable regions of the world."

"NANCY PELOSI, A New Direction for America," her speech, page 6. "During the first 6 months of the Democrat-

controlled Congress, no energy independence legislation has been passed by the House, much less sent to the President's desk. But 228 Democrats voted to impose more than \$6.5 billion in new taxes on small and independent American energy producers, which will lead to less domestic supply, higher prices for consumers, and an increase in America's dependence on foreign sources." That's also from Roll Call.

Let's turn over here a couple of more pages and look at what we can find.

Probably one of the things that Americans worry about most is their security for their families and their children. You know, we don't ever want the United States of America to have to suffer the kind of terrorist activity that our friends in Israel suffer where, when you send your kids to the park to play ball or just swing or just visit with their friends, there is some idiot that wants to blow you up and kill you. We don't want that in this country. Homeland Security is important.

The Democrats, when they ran the last election, they made promises that they would implement all of the 9/11 Commission report. That was kind of their campaign.

"On the first day we control Congress, we will begin by passing all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations," that's what the then minority leader NANCY PELOSI promised in the last election cycle campaign.

Another part of that promise, "House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI says she plans to pass all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations within 100 legislative hours of a Democrat takeover of the House of Representatives." That comes from Congressional Quarterly.

But, now, I am afraid that promise got broken. Let's see what they actually did here. "But the 9/11 package will not include a reorganization of congressional oversight of Homeland Security Department or an attempt to declassify the intelligence budget, despite the fact that those two were key recommendations. Although the Democrats pledged during the election to implement all of the Commission's unfulfilled recommendations, aides now concede that doing so will be harder than they thought," Congressional Daily, December 15, 2006.

"Pass clean spending bills without Iraq policy changes. House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee Ranking Member John Murtha, Democrat from Pennsylvania, told reporters last week that he would not use the spending bills to enact policy on Iraq, a war he strongly opposes." That's from Congressional Daily.

Then we have "A Broken Promise." An editorial in the Arkansas Democrat Gazette accused Democrats of using the supplemental spending bill to author resolutions that would severely restrict supplies and reinforcements for American troops in harm's way and would tie the President's hands by im-

posing all kinds of conditions on his ability to reinforce the troops. It comes from the Arkansas Democrat Gazette editorial, February 21, 2006.

CNN John Roberts questioned JOHN MURTHA, Democrat from Pennsylvania, about his slow-bleed scheme to undermine our generals and our troops on the ground on the American Morning, CNN, April, 2007. Mr. Roberts asked "You heard what President Bush said, that Congress shouldn't be micromanaging the war. What do you say?" JOHN MURTHA, "That's our job, John."

On the upcoming Department of Defense spending bill, it's clear that House Democrats and Representative MURTHA do intend to attach to the latest version of his slow-bleed scheme to undermine our troops. House Democrat leaders are considering votes next month on another legislative package aimed at changing course in Iraq and might announce those plans this week," said aides Monday. "The Iraq language would be an attached to the Defense Appropriations bill." This was June 26, 2007, "Democrats Weighing Attempt to Change Course of Iraq War," another broken promise.

Let's thumb over here just a little bit more and see what we can do. Something that—I just heard a lecture this morning by an expert from over at Georgetown University on international terrorism, where he told us in an hour-long lecture that the resources that we have on the ground, and the intelligence community and the special operations forces that operate are critical in being able to bring down al Qaeda, which is a world-wide network, and, quite frankly, very, very much still alive in countries like England and Western Europe, and their number one target is still to attack the United States of America.

He stressed that we have got to have intelligence at every level assisting us in finding these people. I think this was recognized when we started this session of Congress.

Here is a promise, "We all, Democrats and Republicans alike, take very seriously our responsibility to protect the American people. We know the important role that intelligence plays in that."

Another bill, another promise, "This bill contains robust funding for critical intelligence programs." The first quote was from NANCY PELOSI. This is from SILVESTRE REYES, chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

But here is the broken promise. "Democrats pledge to provide full funding for critical intelligence programs. But just months after taking power, they took precious resources away from critical intelligence programs and used the money to fund research on global warming instead. Led by U.S. Representative SILVESTRE REYES of Texas, a coalition of D.C. Democrats say national security will be better served if the CIA cash is used for global warming research, because apparently there just aren't enough

people studying this issue out there." This is from an article that says Intelligence Committee Threatens National Committee, Detroit News editorial, May 13, 2007.

We can move on. This is fun. You just turn to a page and see what we have got here. I welcome anybody to come turn the page for me. I am not making these things up here.

"Reform Entitlement Spending to Protect Future Generations. This summer, Office of Management and Budget Director Rob Portman said the administration would return to entitlements and taxes in earnest following the elections. Senior Democrats on the House and Senate Budget Committees, Senator Kent Conrad of North Dakota, and Representative John Spratt of South Carolina, responded by saying Congress, not the administration, must drive these efforts." That's from The Hill newspaper.

□ 2015

But the broken promises, but the Democrat budget plan puts off tough and divisive decisions. Democrats did not include proposals to control growth and entitlement programs that are projected to swamp the rest of the budget in coming decades as the baby boom generation retires.

That comes from Congressional Quarterly March 29, 2007. Democrat budget does nothing to curtail runaway entitlement spending, Tallahassee Democrat editorial April 16, 2007.

So we've just got promise after promise after promise. And as my colleague from North Carolina pointed out to us tonight, we've got an approval rating of this Congress at 14 percent, the lowest in the history of the United States Congress, by my understanding. The last time we were close to this low was back when the Democrats were last in power back just before 1994.

This is a sacred body here. And it's important to win elections, and people use a lot of tools to win elections.

But back where I come from, and where a lot of the folks around here come from, when you tell somebody you're going to do something, you ought to do it.

I once had a man tell me, if you ever serve in a legislative body, the greatest tool you take to that body is your word. And if you give somebody your word, you ought to keep it. And if you don't keep it, you ought to go home. And that's a man named Bob Johnson, who there now is an office building in the Capitol complex in Austin, Texas named after this great Texan. That is great advice. And that's why these broken promises, I think, should weigh upon all of us because, quite frankly, a man or a woman's word ought to be their bond. And if you say you're going to do something, you ought to do it, and if you can't do it, you ought to at least try. And if you're not going to try, then you've broken your promise. And that's really not what this House ought to be all about.

I know there's a lot of campaign rhetoric, but a lot of these things were not said in campaign and, in fact, many of them were said right on the floor of this House as a pledge to the colleagues in this House. These pledges shouldn't be broken. We have a duty to raise the level of honor that it now seems to be the American people seem to be perceived is lost in this House of Representatives. I hope we can all take my friend Bob Johnson, who's now passed away, his advice. Let's make our word our bond.

I'll yield back to my colleague from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentleman from Texas for coming over and helping shed some light on this subject. As he has pointed out, and our colleague from Florida pointed out, a lot of things have been said, not just in the heat of a campaign, but in very deliberate opportunities, either on the floor of the House or in plans that were drawn up, in press releases. These were not slips of the tongue that were made.

And let me point out to anyone who might have just joined us that, in addition to having the Official Truth Squad which has been operating for about 18 months here in the House to correct misstatements that are made by the people on the other side of the aisle so often, a group of us are going to be highlighting this new report which has just come out today, House Democrats Top 100 Broken Promises, put together by the Republican leaders offices here in the House of Representatives. We think it's important to highlight what was promised to the American people last year, this year and what have been the results of those.

In fact, while my colleague from Texas was speaking, I was just thinking about the fact that most of our colleagues have left the Chamber tonight, they're on their way home for the 4th of July recess. And I can remember, it has been just a short time ago, that the Democrats promised that they would get all the appropriations bills passed by the 4th of July recess. I'm not sure that that broken promise is even in here. But as of today, we passed 6 out of 12. So half of the appropriations bills got passed.

Now, I've even had some of them accuse us of being the problem in not being able to get the bills passed or not being able to go home on Friday afternoon. And I looked at one of my colleagues one day who said that, and I said, wait a minute; who's in charge here? You all blamed us last year for things we didn't accomplish. Now you're blaming us for things you don't accomplish. I find it very interesting that they're very good at doing that.

So our goal here is to simply hold them accountable. I think the American people want their government held accountable for what we promise to do. And as I said earlier, I'm very troubled by having come to a House that I revere so much, this House of Representatives, and find that the

American people have such a low opinion of us, based partly, I think, on this very situation that we're faced with, promises made, promises broken.

I know when I was a child, and I know with my daughter and with my grandchildren, they take promises very, very seriously. And I think the American people take promises very, very seriously.

And I know that Republicans did not always live up to their reputation of being fiscal conservatives in the last 4 years, I would say, that they were in control of this House. But I don't think anybody can accuse us of having broken promises the way the Democrats have broken promises.

I, like most of my colleagues, want to work with the Democrats on getting things accomplished for the American people. But we find that difficult to do when we know that we can't count on their word.

I want to bring up a few more of these promises that have been made and broken that I think are going to be very, very good for the American people to be reminded of. I'm going to go in this report that's highlighted here to Democratic Promise No. 16, lower gasoline prices. I know this is a big concern in my district. It's a big concern to me. Promise: "Democrats have a plan to lower gas prices. Join Democrats who are working to lower gas prices now." That was said by then minority leader NANCY PELOSI, Democrat, California in a press release, April 19, 2006.

Broken promise: And I'm going to quote from USA Today, May 22, 2007. "The average price of gasoline hit \$3.218 a gallon, up a stunning 11.5 cents the past week, and just half a penny shy of the inflation adjusted record the government reported. The average is almost certain this week to pass the inflation adjusted high of 3.223 recorded in May 1981 by the Energy Information Administration." And that comes from an article entitled Average Gasoline Price Nears 1981 Average. And as I said, it's from USA Today, May 22, 2007.

Democrats have been in power for 6 months and gas prices have gone up, not down.

Democratic Promise No. 17: Make energy reform a top priority. Promise: "Democrats promise to hit the ground running on energy issues if they win control of the House or Senate. Responding to voters concerns about \$3 a gallon gasoline and the soaring cost of home heating oil, Democratic leaders in both Chambers have ranked energy as one of their top priorities for the next Congress." That's from an article entitled Energy Reserving a Front Burner, National Journal, September 9, 2006.

Broken promise: And this is a quote from Energy and Environment Daily, May 18, 2007. "House Speaker NANCY PELOSI, Democrat, California, issued a clear directive soon after Democrats took control of Congress this year, promising a comprehensive energy and

climate change bill on the House floor by the 4th of July. But with five legislative work weeks to go before that deadline, House Democrats are still left with the task of cobbling together a bill from as many as 11 committees. As for the deadline itself, a House Democratic aide close to the process said the package will not arrive on the House floor before the July 4th recess."

Well, that aide was certainly correct. We just adjourned today for the 4th of July recess, and we certainly did not have an energy bill to vote on. And 6 months after the Democrats took power in Congress, no comprehensive energy reform has ever been passed by the House, much less sent to the Senate.

Democratic Promise No. 18: Make global warming a top priority. Promise: Again from Speaker NANCY PELOSI. "The most urgent environmental issue facing us today is global warming." And this comes from a piece attributed to the Speaker, a New Direction for America, page 9.

Broken promise: June 1, 2007, Congress Daily PM. "Pelosi says global warming bill might wait until next year. Doesn't sound like it's a very urgent issue if they're going to put it off for a year."

And the promises and the broken promises related to energy continue to go on and on and on.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. And I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

As you were reading those interesting broken promises, I was thumbing through here and saw my name in one of them so I thought I might read about it. Broken promise No. 43: Protect U.S. Borders. Promise: "I believe there is virtually unanimous agreement in Congress that we must secure our borders and know who is entering our country." Then-House Minority Whip STENY HOYER, press release May 25, 2006.

Promise: "Democrats are for the rule of law. We want to get the border security right. We would do what's necessary to protect our borders." Then House Minority Whip STENY HOYER, press release December 15, 2005.

Broken promise: "Just 6 months after Democrats took power in the House, 114 House Democrats voted against a Republican proposal to provide the funds necessary for construction of at least two layers of reinforced fencing, the installation of additional physical barrier, roads, lighting cameras and sensors pursuant to section 102 (b)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1986." This comes from the GOP Motion to Recommit, a rollcall vote, June 15, 2007.

Broken promise: "218 Democrats voted against an amendment by Representative John Carter, Republican,

Texas to strike new bureaucratic hurdles in the Homeland Security Appropriations bill designed to undermine the Department's efforts to complete the construction of the fence along the border. As Brit Hume said recently on Fox News: 'House Democrats added more than a dozen new rules the administration must meet before it can spend more money on the border fence.' Special report, Brit Hume, Fox News, June 18, 2007." And I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. FOXX. Well, thank you for helping to get on the record these broken promises.

□ 2030

I think over the next several months, we will do our best to make sure that we bring them out one after another, and I am sure we are probably going to have another hundred of them to be able to talk about in the next 6 months without any difficulty.

I want to talk about fiscal responsibility and taxes a little bit because I think this is something else the American people are quite concerned about. Let me talk about Democratic Promise No. 49, "Restore Fiscal Responsibility." Promise: "Democrats offer a New Direction which includes fiscal responsibility." Democratic Caucus Chairman JAMES CLYBURN, press release, October 10, 2006.

Promise: "We will work together to lead the House of Representatives with a commitment to integrity, to civility, and to fiscal responsibility," Speaker-Elect NANCY PELOSI, press release, November 16, 2006.

Promise: "It is imperative to the future of our Nation that we come together, Democrats and Republicans, and restore fiscal responsibility," Majority Leader STENY HOYER, Democrat, Maryland, press release, January 23, 2007.

Broken promise, and this comes from the Post and Courier in Charleston, South Carolina: "CLYBURN Defends Budget Earmarks," February 21, 2007. "Now Democratic Whip JAMES CLYBURN, Democrat, South Carolina, also said he loves appearing in the Citizens Against Government Waste Pig Book. 'I want to be there as often as I possibly can for as much money as I possibly can,' he said."

Folks, these are not conservative publications that are putting these quotes out and calling the Democrats to task. These are what we would generally call liberal newspapers. And there are lots of quotes from the New York Times. I just haven't gotten to them yet.

Broken promise relating to the promises I just read: "Democrats resorted to begging, threatening, and, worst of all, bribing Members for their votes with \$21 billion in pork-barrel projects . . . Loading a bill that's supposed to keep our soldiers in bullets, boots, and beans, pork-barrel bribes for congressional colleagues must be a low point in the history of the U.S. Congress.

This destroys any pretense Democrats have to being a party of fiscal responsibility and good government." This came from the Colorado Springs Gazette editorial, March 27, 2007, in an editorial entitled "Buying Votes; Military Funding Bill a Stain on Congress."

Broken Promise: "It's hard to say which is worse: Democratic leaders offering peanuts for a vote of this magnitude or Members allowing their votes to be bought for peanuts." This is from a USA Today editorial, March 22, 2007, entitled "Pork Has No Place in 'Emergency' War Bill."

These are the kinds of things that make the American public cynical about their elected officials. And it is nothing that the Republicans are saying about the Democrats. It is what the publications of this country are saying about them and showing over and over and over how they have broken their promises. I don't think that we could probably get into a stack up to here of all of the statements that have been made in all of the presses about the broken promises of the Democrats in the first 6 months of their majority reign, but I do think that it is important that we point out some of them so people can make the comparison between what has been said to them and what was promised to them.

Democratic Promise No. 57. It is entitled "Institute 'PAYGO' to Control Spending."

Promise by Speaker NANCY PELOSI on her Web site: "Democrats are committed to fiscal responsibility through pay-as-you-go budgets so that our children and grandchildren are not saddled with mountains of debt."

Broken promise, and again this is not coming from a Republican or conservative publication. This is coming from the San Diego Union Tribune in an editorial dated April 16, 2007. The quote: "In Washington . . . congressional leaders have imposed pay-as-you-go budget rules that exclude the existing entitlement programs, such as Medicare and Medicaid, which dominate Federal spending. So 'PAYGO' is really just political cover for new taxes to support new spending."

Some of the people in the country have gotten this other than the Republican Members of this Congress, and it is very important that these things be published so that people understand what they are doing.

Let me give you one more here. Democratic Promise No. 58, "Adopt Honest Budgets." Promise: "The new Democratic-led House takes America in a new direction, a fiscally responsible budget with the right priorities. Budget Committee Chairman JOHN SPRATT is a master of the budget, and he and his team have done an outstanding job reflecting the right American priorities and values," Speaker NANCY PELOSI, press release, March 21, 2007.

Broken promise: "American families don't have the option of using gim-

micks to put their family budgets in order. But such rules weren't applied by House Democrats in crafting their budget, which is loaded with trickery that hardly reflects American priorities and values. The House and Senate versions of the budget depend on reserve funds to pay for additional spending. There is only one catch: The reserve funds are empty." And the title of this, "Democrats Banking on Empty Reserves." The source, Los Angeles Times, March 27, 2007. Again, hardly a conservative place to come up.

We talked earlier about earmarks, and I think that it is very important, again, that we talk a little bit more about the issue of earmarks because I think that was one of the more egregious of the promises that were made and then broken by the Democrats. And had we not called their hand on it 2 weeks ago in this very Chamber with our standing up and protesting what they were doing to keep the earmarks a secret so that the American people could not judge whether the votes we were taking on the bills were votes that we should be taking, but, no, the Democrats had promised transparency, but they weren't about to do it until we made them do it.

Democratic Promise No. 68: "Allow Lawmakers to Challenge Individual Earmarks." Promise: "I think, first of all, with any bill, any provision, whether it is an earmark or not, there should be transparency. So that is what we have said, and I hope you would agree, that before Members vote on a bill, there should be appropriate time for people to be able to read it, that it would be a matter of public record, and if there is an earmark that can stand the scrutiny, then that transparency will give the opportunity for it to be there," then Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI in a press conference, March 16, 2006.

Broken promise: "Rather than including specific pet projects, grants, and contracts in legislation as it is being written, Democrats are following an order by House Appropriations Committee chairman to keep the bills free of such earmarks until it is too late for critics to effectively challenge them." The title of the article: "House Democrats Sidestep Their Own Rule to Shield Lawmakers' Pet Projects From Scrutiny," Associated Press, June 3, 2007.

As I said earlier, we believe that it is our responsibility to bring to the American people a list of these broken promises, the promises made and then the promises broken, because the House Democrats haven't kept their promises to the American people, whether it is the result of inaction or an inability to govern. On issue after issue, the 110th Congress has failed to meet the needs of working families, soldiers battling radical jihadists, senior citizens, and others who are waiting



for Washington to offer serious solutions to the problems facing the country. One look at the polls shows Americans are taking notice and they aren't pleased.

But where the majority is failing to lead, Republicans are stepping up. While Democrats broke their promise to operate the House floor in an open, fair, and bipartisan manner, Republicans have found ways to strengthen and expose flaws in Democratic bills. While Democrats broke their promise to lead the most open, honest, and ethical Congress in history, Republicans are pushing for commonsense ethics rules that hold lawmakers to a higher standard. While Democrats broke their promise to deliver transparency in spending taxpayer dollars, Republicans have forced the majority to restore GOP earmark reforms that bring greater transparency and accountability to Federal spending. While Democrats broke their promise to enact legislation that makes America energy independent, Republicans believe we can lower gas prices and reduce our dependence on foreign energy by increasing domestic energy supplies, conserving more, and investing in the technologies of tomorrow. While Democrats broke their promise to be fiscally responsible increasing taxes and spending in tandem, Republicans put forth a plan that balances the Federal budget without raising taxes. And while Democrats broke their promise to make national and homeland security a priority, House Republicans have stood united to provide our troops the resources they need to defeat al Qaeda and radical jihadists and are determined to secure our borders and enforce our immigration laws.

While Republicans are working to earn back the majority, Democrats are acting like the entrenched majority they led before, saying one thing to Americans outside of Washington and doing something different inside the Capitol building.

Over the next few weeks, every House Democrat must answer this key question: Why haven't you kept your promises?

I don't have a Web site available like some of the other groups do. But I can tell you that this publication, "House Democrats' Top 100 Broken Promises," will be available from any Republican Member of this Congress, and I am sure that we can make it available. I am sure it is on a Web site, probably on the Web sites of all of the leadership: Republican Leader JOHN BOEHNER, Republican Whip ROY BLUNT, Conference Chair ADAM PUTNAM, Policy Chairman THADDEUS MCCOTTER, Conference Vice Chair KAY GRANGER, Conference Secretary JOHN CARTER, Chief Deputy Whip ERIC CANTOR, Rules Committee Ranking Republican DAVID DREIER. My guess is that it can be found on any of their Web sites. I am going to make sure that it is on my Web site in the next few days.

But I think, again, it is important that we hold people to the promises

that they have made and make sure that the American people don't continue to have this very negative opinion of the Congress of the United States. We want this House to be respected. We want the Senate to be respected. And we need to live up to our promises so that we can get on with the important work that the American people have sent us here to do.

This is the people's House, and I am extraordinarily proud to be a Member of this House. And I know I join with other Republicans in saying that we want to bring back respect and integrity to this House so it is not called a House of hypocrisy.

□ 2045

#### AMERICA, MISSISSIPPI THANKS YOU

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALL of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, about 22 months ago the Mississippi Gulf Coast was hit with the worst hurricane in our Nation's history. It was followed up by a disaster made by man, which was the insurance industry almost uniformly denying the claims of people who had paid their premiums for decades. So people who thought they were covered woke up the next day or the next week to discover that their house was gone, and that their insurance company that said they were in "good hands" or that might have been their "good neighbor" or were "on their side" weren't going to pay.

It has led to several problems, one of which will be addressed, we hope, in July with a promise by the Speaker PELOSI, Chairman FRANK, Chairwoman WATERS for a hearing in the Financial Services Committee to amend the National Flood Insurance Program to allow people to buy all-perils insurance through their Nation, something that will prevent the fight in the future in other areas of America where 52 percent of Americans live. So if they go through the same sort of tragedy that the people of Mississippi went through, that they will be paid. Because the only people who did pay their claims last time, uniformly, was our Nation through the National Flood Insurance Program.

One of the ways that the American people responded to that, Mr. Speaker, is that by the thousands, all the way from kindergartners to grandparents, volunteers that have come to south Mississippi, they volunteered their time, they have given of their own personal treasure to help the people of south Mississippi rebuild who should have been paid by the insurance industry but won't. We've had so many groups. And I wish I could name them

all and I wish I could have thanked them all.

But one of the groups I did get a chance to visit with just recently was the St. Elizabeth Seton Catholic Church of Naperville, Illinois, again, one of the thousands of groups that have been to south Mississippi and continue to go to south Mississippi to help people rebuild their lives.

We want to thank them and all the groups, but I also want to recognize a letter that they sent to my office. And it's strange that they should even be thanking someone from my office, it is my office that should be thanking them. But I want to read their letter in gratitude for them, and thank them as a way of thanking all the people that helped.

"We are eternally grateful to you for sharing with us one of Mississippi's finest natural resources, Chris LaGarde." Chris is an employee in my office.

Since we first met Chris a year ago, we've come to know him as a dear friend, a counselor, a leader, a chef, a mentor and a pack rat. He is a great big energizer bunny in a bright orange jumpsuit, not only because he never stops, but because his presence energizes all of us. Chris is a man of compassion and passion. He is caring, loving, generous and the most humble man you could ever meet. He's an excellent chef and host.

Through all of the trials and tribulations of finding work for our 60 volunteers all week and feeding us twice this week, he always kept his composure, his sense of humor and his love for all of us. He is a role model not only for young adults, but for us older adults as well. He lends perspective to what is really important in all of our lives, not our iPods, TVs, cell phones, cars and homes, but our friends, family and fellow human beings.

Chris is the epitome of the face of Christ, of service, of love for his fellow man.

To the folks of St. Elizabeth Seton, know what you've said is really about yourselves and about the other people who've come to south Mississippi to help us out. And on behalf of the people of south Mississippi, I want to thank all of those volunteers for what they have done and what they continue to do. And on behalf of not only the people of south Mississippi, but all of our fellow Americans, I think our fellow Americans have truly risen to the occasion. And I, for one, am eternally grateful for their help.

#### ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE WHITE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I'm here tonight with my distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) to talk



in this Chamber about accountability, and to talk about our security in the Middle East, our strategy for the war in Iraq, the problems the American people face with the leadership of this country, which does not seem, at the very top echelon, the President and the Vice President, to be able to respond to the clearly expressed will of the American people, the facts on the ground in Iraq, the advice from esteemed military commanders and generals who understand the situation in Iraq.

And, really, it all comes down to accountability. Because Mr. KLINE and I came to this body as a result of the elections of November 2006. And in those elections, the American people spoke loudly and clearly. In my home State of New Hampshire, they said we need a new direction in Iraq; our strategy is not working.

The war in Iraq has not made us safer. The war in Iraq is not enhancing American security. The war in Iraq is not stabilizing the Middle East and advancing our true national security interests. The war in Iraq is costing billions and billions and billions of dollars, sapping our military strength and readiness, and leaving us, as a Nation, poorer and unable to respond to conflicts around the globe and the urgent need of domestic priorities at home, the needs of working families here in America who need the kinds of funds that are being diverted into a war that is not working, that need to be used at home to help take care of Americans.

Now I'd like to yield to Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

I appreciate the opportunity to be here tonight as members of our freshman class. We try to get together about once a week to speak to each other and to speak to the Members on the floor here about the importance of what we were elected to do, along with every other Member, Democrat and Republican, in this Chamber.

Certainly this last election had a lot to do with the war and the strategy of the war and whether waging the war in the way it was being waged was successful. And of course success, at least in my view and the people that I have spoken to, is what can we do to enhance and protect the American people? All of us, in our homes, our cities, our country, and certainly our friends abroad.

At this time, it seems pretty clear, and I think it's been pretty clear to the American people for a long time who have been ahead of the President and ahead of the Congress in their thinking about this, that the national security of our country, of course coming first, is not being enhanced by having our fighting men and women, our brave men and women fighting a war that by and large is the participation of a civil war, a civil war among groups of people that unfortunately have been fighting each other for a long, long time; that by us dropping in our own form of de-

mocracy in that region, it just doesn't necessarily work that way. Although we would like to believe as Americans, and we know that we have the best system in the world, it just can't be planted in some other part of the world and just accepted as it is.

So the reality is, what can we do? What are the choices? And I have not been one who said immediate withdrawal. There are some in this Chamber that believe in immediate withdrawal, there are some that say we should be there for 10, 20, 30, 50 years, as long as it takes.

I think the reality is, there has to be a better way. And I think that we've heard from many of our military experts. When President Bush says, let's listen to the military experts, I agree. But it's not just the military experts that are telling you what you want to hear, it's the military experts that have been our generals, people that have served in that region, continue to serve in that region, and not just as soon replace them if they don't agree with the present administration.

There are answers, just like anything else. It doesn't matter if it's health care or energy, there are answers to all these things. People solve problems all day long. Americans are very innovative, energetic people. There are answers to this one as well. They may not be the answers we're looking for that are the ultimate best answers, but there are ways that we can best protect our interests in the Middle East, our support of the State of Israel and other friends in that region, and then most importantly, the people that live in our country. And those may be redeployment, moving our troops out of harm's way and into areas where maybe the borders are secured; or maybe, as we know now, the major mistake was that the entire Iraqi leadership of its armed forces was basically eviscerated, they're gone and moved away. And so the result is you have an Iraqi Army that by and large is leaderless. And they've been trying to make amends on that and trying to deal with that, but they're still way behind their curve. We can probably provide some support in that area.

But we do also know at the same time, in terms of our national security interests, if we think about what brought us to this point so far and why we have this threat of terrorism, is because we were attacked on 9/11, nothing to do with Iraq, but Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda. That issue has to do with Afghanistan and maybe other areas of Pakistan. That's where our military might, our strength, our troops, our ability to build coalitions around the world, which we've lost along the way here, that's where we can have the most impact.

So Mr. HODES, I would just like to open with those thoughts. I know we're going to have a little bit of discussion on that. But I want the American people to know and I want our Members here in the Chamber to understand,

there are choices; there are good choices, there are better choices, and there are choices to move forward. To stand still, to say the surge and all those things, we need to move forward and best protect our troops and best protect Americans.

Mr. HODES. Mr. KLEIN, one of the things I think about is the change in the dialogue that has occurred since the Democrats became the majority party here in the House of Representatives as a result of the elections of November 2006.

And I know that there are many people in this country who are extremely frustrated. More than 70 percent of the people in this country, the statistics now tell us, are committed to changing course in Iraq, despite the intransigence, the stubbornness, the refusal of the President to face reality, despite the refusal of the Vice President of this country to meet his own obligations to the people of this country. But the dialogue has changed.

It's very important, I think, to take stock of what has happened, where we are now and how we are moving forward, and also to talk about the accountability of the administration and the Republicans, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who have stood foursquare up until now with the failed policies of this President.

The picture that I have put up here is a picture of President Bush with virtually the entire Republican delegation standing with him when he rejected the Democrats' attempt to set reasonable guidelines for troop readiness, for benchmarks, for Iraqi accountability, and a timeline for the responsible, strategic redeployment of American troops to protect our security.

We've heard a lot in the past few days, in the past few months from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who keep blasting Democrats. They say, well, we're not getting anything done. But Democrats have stood up time and time again to help push a new direction in Iraq. And frankly, and unfortunately, it's been our Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have not helped move this along, who have not stood up to their President and said to our President, this is an American issue. We must all work together for a responsible strategy that protects American security.

Now, after 6 months in the majority, House and Senate Democrats really are changing the debate on the war. We're insisting that the Bush administration and the Iraqi Government be held accountable. We need benchmarks to measure progress, or the lack thereof. We need to challenge the stay-the-course strategy, and we will continue to challenge this President's stay-the-course strategy.

And what is not too surprising to me now, as we sit here today ready for the July 4th recess and about 6 months into the 110th Congress, under pressure from responsible Democrats and the American public, an increasing number

of Senate Republicans are now distancing themselves from the President's policy, even as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, our House Republicans, continue to cling to it. The question is, when will the rubber-stamp House Republicans face the reality, join the Democrats, together with the American people, in demanding a real change and a responsible, strategic redeployment of our forces from Iraq? That, as you said, doesn't necessarily mean and shouldn't mean, in my view, that we bring everybody home in a precipitous fashion. That's what the Republicans continue to claim Democrats are talking about, but nothing could be further from the truth. Because the Democratic Caucus and the American people understand that what is needed is a responsible, strategic redeployment to protect American security.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. And Mr. HODES, I would absolutely agree with you. And I think the proof is in the pudding back home. When I go back home and I speak to folks in town hall meetings in Palm Beach County and Broward County in south Florida where I live, I've heard from Democrats, Republicans and independents. And nobody wears their party on their sleeve, you just hear from them and they explain how they feel. And they feel very strongly that, as former military, there are a lot of senior citizen veterans in my area, they fought so hard for our country and the values and the strength that they have for the belief in the military and the strength that they have for the belief in our country and doing the right thing as we did in World War II and as we've done so many times since then. And they feel that what is going on right now is weakening the military, weakening America, as a standard bearer for truth and strength in the world, and this hurts. This hurts them, as people who fought so hard for our country.

□ 2100

I am not 70 years old. I am not 80 years old. But I have so many people that have expressed that to me as they wear their hats, as they wear their uniform, as they come and talk about their own personal experiences. We certainly have that generation.

Then we have the generation of parents whose kids may enlist or are already in the military. Some believe that what the military is doing is just right. Some feel very bad and feel like, not that their sons and daughters aren't doing the right thing on behalf of the country, they just feel like the strategy is not what they have made that representation, that commitment about.

I also feel like you do, that I am beginning to see, and I know in some of the committee hearings we have had in the House of Representatives we have heard expressions by both Democrats and Republicans. We are starting to hear from Republicans, too, about

questions raised and looking for that accountability.

The bottom line is this: This is the Iraqis' war. This is the Iraqis' responsibility to take their own country and build it back up. That is their civilian ability, their ability to put the electricity back on, build hospitals and create jobs for themselves and put down the terror and the people that are harassing them in the cities and the explosives going on. They have got to take their own bull by the horns and do something about themselves. We can't do that. They have to do that. So there is this responsibility that they have to stand up to themselves and recognize.

We did what we said we were going to do. We took out Saddam Hussein and gave them a fresh opportunity. Saddam Hussein was a tyrant. He was a bad guy. But let's now look to the next level. The next responsibility is for the Iraqi people to stand up for themselves. We can't fight their war for them. We can't fight that for them. We have our own responsibilities.

We have to deal with Iran right now. Iran is a serious threat to Israel and our interests around the world, North Korea, obviously, and Afghanistan. These are places where the United States military needs to be able to be strong and exert itself when needed.

Mr. HODES. Mr. KLEIN, I want to pick up on a few points you made, because as I have traveled around New Hampshire, I have met with numerous veterans and lots of folks in the active military. The people in New Hampshire are not especially liberal, left-wing people. They are Americans.

This issue is really an issue of what it means to be a patriot. Because we all want the best outcome we can possibly make for this country, for our troops, for our veterans, for our wounded warriors. We want to do the best we can for America. On whatever side of this debate about the proper policy, I think we all need to respect each other's views on that.

I find that in New Hampshire. But what I find is a deep yearning that this country is accountable to the American people, that our government is accountable to the American people in a way that sets us on a course for being number one.

Now, I don't mean that in any big, bullying way, but number one because, up until recently, in my years—I have been around for 56 years—this country stood on its values. We stood on the principles of truth, justice, fairness, equality, and opportunity for all. That is what the American people expect from their government. That is where they want our country to go. They see that the war in Iraq has diverted us from being as great as we can be, from fulfilling the true promise of America both in the blood and treasure of our brave soldiers lost in the sands of Iraq.

They also are very concerned. I speak to people about some of what happened and the mistakes that were made that produced the issues that we are in

today. They are very concerned, for instance, that while 9/11 was caused by al Qaeda terrorists in Afghanistan with the Taliban, that the Bush administration not only implied but said that somehow, Saddam Hussein and Iraq were tied in with al Qaeda at the time of that attack. It just wasn't so.

We have made some serious mistakes that they see. They see that the object of going in, occupying Baghdad and immediately firing the civil service, de-Baathification, firing the Army, simply provided fuel for the insurgency, provided people and weapons to fight against stability in Iraq. They see those questions.

Now the question they are asking is, where to? Where do we go from here? The good news is that some of the Republican Senators have begun to see the light. I just want to quote one of our distinguished colleagues who is in the Senate Chamber, Senator RICHARD LUGAR, the distinguished Republican from Indiana, the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee, who said, "In my judgment, the costs and risks of continuing down the current path outweigh the potential benefits that might be achieved. Persisting indefinitely with the surge strategy will delay policy adjustments that have a better chance of protecting our vital interests over the long term. Our security interests call for a downsizing and redeployment of U.S. military forces to a more sustainable position." That was a speech by Senator LUGAR, a Republican from Indiana, on the Senate floor on June 25 of this year. He is beginning to face the reality and getting ready for a new direction in Iraq.

We have now been joined by our distinguished colleague, JASON ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania. We are delighted to have you with us. He often speaks with the 30-Something Group. It is a real treat to have him with the New Member Caucus tonight. The Class of 2006 welcomes you, JASON.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Thank you, Mr. HODES. It is an honor to see you here tonight, as well as Mr. KLEIN from Florida.

We are at our 6-month point. We have one of our freshman colleagues in the Chair tonight. Mr. HALL from New York is serving as the Speaker pro tempore this evening. We are in the Chamber here tonight; we are talking about the first 6 months. We are talking about what is certainly the most important issue facing the country, as anyone would agree, which is the war in Iraq. We are talking about accountability. As the gentleman pointed out, we have a President that seems to be struggling with accountability right now.

If you look at what has happened in Iraq, we talk about the surge. We are going to have this report in September on whether the surge has worked. We all pray that we get good news in September, that General Petraeus is going

to come in and give us an accurate assessment and, hopefully, that assessment will be that things are turning around.

But it does not appear at this point that that is the case. In fact, as you well know, Mr. HODES, the last 3 months where the surge has been fully in effect and we have been over there, have been the bloodiest 3 months in the 4½ years we have been in Iraq. The last 3 months have been the worst 3 months. That does not bode well for the effectiveness of the surge.

As you said, we are over 3,500 now that have been killed and 25,000 injured, wounded and that is just a tragic situation.

I was able to tour Walter Reed soon after that incident came to light with the Washington Post, and perhaps you gentlemen did as well. What strikes you when you meet these men and women, they are the bravest and the brightest and the best this country has to offer. To think that we have a situation where we were giving them substandard care in a military hospital, and in the Department of Defense, we chronically underfund our VA health care systems all across the country. So you have the Defense health care system that Walter Reed was a part of, and that was a disgraceful situation; then on the other hand, for the past several years, we have chronic underfunding of the VA health care system.

So when we talk about this administration's record with regard to accountability and what happens after these brave men and women come home, we have the issue of multiple deployments where the Guard and Reserve families have to struggle with multiple deployments and extended deployments going from 1 year to 18 months. Some of these veterans are small business owners or work in small firms where they have to go to their employer and say, I have to go over to Iraq, I have to serve this country. Of course, the employer says, that is wonderful, you have my support. Then they have to go back a second time, maybe a third.

Again, for the ones that own their own business and are the person that is running the business, how are they going to keep that business afloat? It affects the family. It affects the children. This has so many repercussions. Every segment of our society is impacted by it. But we have a President that has been given the views of the American people—we are going to talk about that tonight—but they have been disregarded.

Sixty-nine percent of the American people think we are heading down the wrong road in Iraq and that we need to change course. Instead, we get more of the same. We have an administration that was given a blueprint for success by the Iraq Study Group 6 months ago now, 7 months ago. Instead of following it, or at least looking at it, it was promptly discarded.

We have an administration that has ignored the advice of his generals on

the ground. Whenever they tell him something he doesn't want to hear, they have resigned or they are fired. So I lack the confidence that this administration is going to be able to view the Iraq situation as anything more than "stay the current course." We all know that we need a different course.

We were talking about accountability. I did just want to tell one story that is related to the way this administration views our men and women and the families that are serving this country. I had a constituent in town today. She is an 84-year-old Gold Star mother. Her son was killed in 1969 in Vietnam. She has not been to Washington, D.C. She has not seen the Wall with her son's name on it, the Vietnam War Memorial. She called our office 2 weeks ago and explained her situation. She said, "I am bringing my two daughters, who are obviously grown now. They are the sisters of the serviceman that was killed in 1969. They are going to come down together as a family for the first time." Her goal, her life-long dream, was to tour the White House. So we called the White House. As you certainly know, there is a 6-month waiting list. But there is an exception in special circumstances. One of those circumstances, we were told, you were probably told, were for Gold Star families.

□ 2115

They can get in and take that tour of the White House.

So we were told, sure, they are welcome. We sent the information over, and then we promptly got a phone call saying, well, no, no, that exception only works for Iraq and Afghanistan Gold Star families, not for Vietnam era families.

So we had to call back this 84-year-old woman who wanted to see the Vietnam War Memorial and her son's name on the wall for the first time, and wanted to tour the White House, it was her lifelong dream, and we had to tell her well, I am sorry, we are not going to be able to do that, because the White House does not allow that.

Then it came to my attention that we as Members of Congress in very rare circumstances are allowed to take groups down and put them in the line if we appear with them. So I called her and I said, you know, I am going to just do this myself.

So today we took her down and we put her in the line and she got her tour of the White House.

So I sent a letter to President Bush and I said, there is two issues here. One is this policy is ridiculous. How can you justify putting one group of families who have suffered the greatest loss imaginable in the service of our country ahead of another group of families? How can you put one generation of military Gold Star families ahead of another?

The second issue is, what is the policy? Can you explain it? What is the justification for it? And please change

it. That was the situation. I was fortunate as a Member of Congress, I was able to get Ms. Boyer in. But, unfortunately, you wonder how many people around the country have made a similar effort and were unable to get in on this tour.

So, I really thought this was a disgraceful situation, and I did want to bring it to the attention of my freshmen colleagues, because this is something that just happened today. And I think it is indicative of the treatment that our military families are getting from this administration.

I talked about the fact that we have had 6 consecutive years prior to this one of chronic underfunding of our VA healthcare system. You see the result at Walter Reed, what happens when you don't provide enough funding for these institutions. Unfortunately, we as a nation were doing that over the last several years.

But this Congress took a step in the right direction to resolve that by providing the largest increase in the history, 77-year history of the VA health care system, and in the 6 months we have been here, we have voted for \$13 billion in increased funding for the VA healthcare system.

We have also voted to increase screenings and treatment for traumatic brain injury, which is now the signature issue for the Iraq war veterans. Many of the people who would have perished in previous wars, because of increased technology and military equipment, we have a lot of amputees and we have a lot of head injuries. So the issues we face are different from issues we faced in previous wars with regard to treating the men and women that come home.

So we are going to screen them and we are going to treat them for traumatic brain injury and we are going to make that part of what we are doing in the VA healthcare system.

So this Congress has taken a step in the direction of honoring our Nation's veterans, and I am proud at our 6-month point of our first term in Congress that we can go home over the July 4th recess and talk about the fact that no Congress in the history of the Congress has ever done more for our Nation's veterans than we have, in just 6 months. So I am proud to talk about that.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you. I appreciate your observing those things that we did, because I think every one of us believes it is the right thing to do. I know, just to share for a moment, the experience that all of us had at Walter Reed Hospital and the experiences that we have all had in visiting our veterans and our folks who have fought for you us so bravely back home.

The point you made is that many of these men and women back in Vietnam, back in other wars, would have died based on the injuries they have received. But instead, because of modern science, they are alive today, some of

them. But the injuries are so substantial, loss of both legs, loss of arms, loss of major functions that they have, they are going to require a lifetime of care. And every American needs to understand that is a responsibility we have. When we ask our men and women to fight for us, we better be prepared to make sure they have all the necessary cares, and their families get that same level of care. Because it is that support, that when we ask people to fight for the values and strength of our country, that needs to be there.

But that is a cost of this war. And the problem, of course, is that if in fact, as we started this conversation tonight, we are not achieving our national security interests, we are not making Americans safer at home or our friends overseas more secure, if we are not accomplishing any of that, and we are going to wait until September now, and unfortunately there may be another 300 or 400 of our brave men and women losing their lives for something that again is not accomplishing those goals, and we are spending another \$40 billion or \$50 billion, I think a lot of Americans are saying, what could we do with that amount of money? What could we do with those lost lives back here at home, those lost lives, the lost opportunities for the families and men and women fighting for us?

I know when I think about Florida where I am from, they already have 139 men and women killed. We have had 1,196 severely injured. These are our neighbors. These are our friends.

We had just tragically this past week, a young man, 25 years old, Daniel Agami, who, unfortunately, was killed recently by, of course, an IED. I know that every one of us in this Chamber, and I think out there in the country, they have been through this loss. They understand what that neighbor, that nephew, that son, that daughter, what it means.

A lot of Americans haven't been really affected by this war because maybe the numbers are not as significant as they were during Vietnam or during World War II. But it is an American. Every loss of life is an American, and I think we all share that sense of feeling and, of course, that empathy for the families.

The question we are raising now, of course, the national commitment we have to fight wars is there. The strength and understanding our military always has to be at the ready. But we should also understand that when we do fight wars, that we need to win, succeed, do whatever is necessary, but, at the same time, be smart about it. Accomplish the goals that we have and recognize that in this dangerous world that we live in today, in this present strategy that President Bush has executed and is unwilling to change to this point in time, we have made ourselves weaker in other theaters, in other places around the world. That is unacceptable to me. It is unacceptable to every person I would imagine who is

concerned about the future of our country.

We are prepared to change that. I am very happy that Democrats have changed, as you said, Mr. HODES, the discussion in Washington, taking the discussion back in our streets at home, our main streets back at home up here, finding even Republicans now who I know believe and, of course, they want to do the right thing as well, but just a blind loyalty to the President's policy at this point is not the right thing to do. We need to think, use common sense, figure out the right way to redeploy, protect our men and women over there, do the right thing so the Middle East can be stabilized and we can fight our real battles and deal with Iran and Afghanistan and other places.

Mr. HODES. Mr. KLINE, thank you very much for those thoughts. I expect that over this July 4th recess, a number of our colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle, will probably be hearing from their constituents about their concerns about the current course in Iraq, the failure of this administration's strategy, with the surge and the way things have been handled, the numerous mistakes, both strategic and implementation and in conception have deeply, deeply hurt us.

I know the American people, as we are here in Congress, especially in discussions with Democratic Members on the Armed Services Committee, are deeply concerned that American readiness, that our readiness to deal with other conflicts that may arise, not be jeopardized, and we are going to take important steps and have taken important steps to improve the readiness that has been hurt by these deployments in Iraq.

At some point we are going to talk a little bit more about what it has meant for our veterans, but we have been joined by another distinguished colleague who I would like to introduce. JOE SESTAK, a member of the class of 2006 from Pennsylvania, came to this Congress with an extraordinarily distinguished career, serving our country in the military in the Navy.

He is a gentleman who understands military, military matters, military operations. He is deeply committed to American strategic interests and is in the forefront of those in the Democratic Caucus who are intent on seeing a new direction in Iraq.

I would like to now turn it over to you, JOE SESTAK.

Mr. SESTAK. I appreciate that from my colleague from New Hampshire.

I want to comment upon what all three of you brought out, and I thought brought out well. I would like to speak about it from my experience.

I remember being on the ground in Afghanistan 2 months after that war began. I had the opportunity during a very short period of time to see what needed to be done. I left, brought back an aircraft carrier battle group for that war. Then we brought that battle group into the Persian Gulf for what we

thought would be the starting run of the Iraqi conflict, and thinking what a tragic misadventure this would be.

Those words were brought back to me as I thought about them 18 months later when I returned on the ground in Afghanistan and saw what had not been accomplished when I had known what had to be done. Because we diverted our attention and our resources, our Psychological Operations Forces, our Special Operations Forces, our Civil Affairs Forces and the attention of this Nation from Afghanistan to Iraq.

To me, Afghanistan is prey to terrorists now once again as the Taliban regain control in parts of the southern provinces. And as we look inserting more forces back into Afghanistan, it is a poster child for what Iraq is really about.

Iraq is a conflict, a civil war that has hurt our strategic security, and Afghanistan is merely a poster child for how the rest of our global security, as well as our homeland security, has suffered.

There is not one army unit here at home, not one, Army, Guard, Active Guard or Reserve, that is in a state of readiness, that is committed to deploy anyplace in the world, as was said earlier, to any contingency elsewhere, from Korea to the Western Pacific, to help our other forces. Nor are we engaged in this world where the true center of gravity, strategic gravity for the United States is over the next decade, the Western Pacific, nor in Southeast Asia, nor in the Middle East.

We have walked away from a strategy of engagement in this world as we have narrowed down to a conflict that is a civil war in one country. We need to step back and look at Iraq. Not as itself alone, but as a piece in our strategic template of how we look at the security environment across this world. Therefore, we need a change in this strategy.

It is not about getting out of Iraq, as you well said. It is not just about returning our troops home. It is about a proper redeployment of our forces in order to enhance the security of America.

I am not anti-war. I am pro-security. And the Democratic approach to this is one that recognizes and should recognize with the Republicans, because we need them and they need us, to define the end of what President Bush said on 10 January would not be an open-ended commitment.

We need to define that end as a certain date, a specific date, approximately a year, that says to everyone in that region that behavior now has the incentive to change, because we will no longer be in Iraq providing the political and military cover for this civil war to continue to simmer as the politicians in Iraq, failing to step up to the plate because they are pursuing their personal fiefdoms, their personal ambitions in the 32 ministries that they run, as we provide their security.

And of great importance is Iran. When I was there with Senator HAGEL

a few months ago, everyone talked about the undue influence of Iran. Why not? We are in there bleeding, and that country wants us to bleed profusely. But if we were to set a date certain and to lead with confidence and engage Iran and Syria, to bring them to the table, our most senior political leader, U.S. political leader in Iraq said in response to a question, Iran does not want a failed state if we redeploy.

It may not want the government we want, but it does not want a failed state. It doesn't want the 2 million Iraqi refugees there that have not already overflowed Iraq's borders to continue to flow over Iran's. Nor does it want a proxy war between it, the Shi'as in Iran supporting the Shia in Iraq, and the Sunnis in Syria supporting the Sunnis in Iraq. Once we are out, they don't want that war to ensue.

So, what this future plan is to be about is a redeployment to enhance America's security by focusing where we need to in this world, beginning with Afghanistan, and a readiness here at home to bring it back up, to remain in that region on bases we already have and had before the conflict with troops there in Qatar, Oman, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, with a carrier battle group and amphibious ready group, and then deal with strength as we safely redeploy over a year's period, approximately. Because it took 6 months to redeploy out of Somalia with approximately 8,000 troops.

We have got 160,000 in Iraq and over 100,000 U.S. civilian contractors to safely redeploy. As we do this with a date certain and incentive to change the behavior of the Iraqis so they step up to the plate, knowing they must assume responsibilities, it brings the Iranians and Syrians together, with us remaining in the region, to have a strategy that leads to diplomacy, so that there is an accommodation for a non-failed state. A region we have our interests in, we will remain there, and a state that has brought the parties together under the incentive of a date certain to work towards stability.

I appreciate being able to make these comments which tonight's discussion I believe have really pointed us towards a strategic approach to a date to redeploy.

Mr. HODES. I thank you for those comments. Coming from someone with the kind of military experience you have, they ring especially true.

You know, often on the floor of the House of Representatives, what we have experienced in our first 6 months is political rhetoric that masks some of the deeper, more complex and nuanced issues that really are worthy of discussion in deciding as a nation how to move forward.

It is really what the American people have been asking, not only of us here in Congress, but especially of their President, their Vice President, the leaders in the White House, who have been responsible for this unfortunate failed policy. And what the American

people, who are a generous, compassionate and patient people, have been deeply yearning for, is a real discussion of the kind we are having now, that points the way towards American security. Because, as you point out, we have created, unfortunately, more instability in the Middle East.

□ 2130

And now, however we got into it, we have to make the best of a bad situation because we are all in this together. That is the spirit with which we as Democrats are trying to talk to our Republican colleagues.

There has been a lot of name-calling on the floor. They call us cut-and-run and say this and that and the other thing. But as you have so well put, we are talking about a strategy. Strategy is the key word. It means a strategic redeployment to protect American security.

If we just step back for a moment, I want to share some of the thoughts of a very esteemed retired general, General William Odom, who addressed us recently about the situation there. He said, Look at the situation we are in. Our troops are in a sea of hostile people, approximately 7 million in number, and growing in hostility every day. Fully 80 percent of the Iraqis want the occupation to end. Fifty percent of them think badly enough about us that they would sanction violence against Americans.

We are surrounded in Iraq by unfriendly nations, Iran and Syria. We have problems with Hezbollah in Lebanon; Hamas and new issues for Israel. Israel's security has been threatened by the instability in the Middle East because, unfortunately, our misadventure in Iraq has emboldened Islamic jihadists in the region. It has not made us more safe, but has grown the Islam jihad movement. It has been the best recruiting device they have had.

So he understands the importance of what to do when American troops find themselves caught in the middle of not one civil war, as he put it, but in the middle of multiple civil wars. He addressed the concern, which is a valid concern on the part of all of us, of what will happen in Iraq when we redeploy in a planned strategic way. People are concerned. What will we leave?

We have a government at this point which is essentially not working. It is hardly a unity government. They can't get themselves together to have their army stand up or get the ministers to work together. They seem to have fallen into tribal allegiances.

But what General Odom pointed out in recent discussions with experts in the region, including generals of countries whom we have worked with, they have pointed out that it is highly likely that when we leave Iraq, when the American troop presence, which is the cause, in their view, of much instability, is gone, that Iraq—it is not going to be great, but the kind of cataclysmic events that people are pre-

dicting, in their view, won't occur because the Iraqis have had a long history of tribal conflict even within the Saddam Hussein regime. And remembering that Iraq was forged in 1916 out of separate tribal entities by the British and French in a grand deal, there has been an undercurrent of these tensions, which the tribal leaders, they believe, are going to work out.

Personally, I believe ultimately there will be a political solution in Iraq that the Iraqis must determine for themselves. Our military presence cannot impose a political solution; only they can. In my view, based on the research that I have done and based on discussions with experts in the region, I think it is highly likely that Iraq will devolve into some kind of autonomous regions, perhaps three autonomous regions. In Kurdistan, one representing the Sunnis, one representing the Shia, who then use the central government for certain federal purposes, but one which recognizes, as their constitution wants to go to, that a political solution, trying to hold together this government which isn't working, won't work for them, and they will find once we are gone and they no longer have us as a crutch, they will find the political solution they need to carry their country forward.

And if we, as a true world leader, redeploy strategically and wisely and then use our diplomatic resources to bring neighbors, allies, friends, reunite a real coalition in the world to help, we may be able to have the kind of result of a stable state that will help us not only in the region but around the world. And it is what the American people want.

It is this kind of discussion and this kind of thinking that the President ought to be having with his generals. I hope that as we sit here tonight talking about Iraq, and as we prepare to return home for July 4, I hope that President Bush is in the White House and I hope he is talking to his generals about what the plan ought to be for a strategic redeployment. But I fear that he is not doing that at this point.

Mr. ALTMIRE, why don't I throw it over to you.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I was struck in hearing my Pennsylvania colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK), I believe the highest ranking military officer ever elected to Congress; and so much of the rhetoric that revolved around the discussion that this House had on Iraq was, you guys don't have any experience, you don't know what you are talking about. All you want to do is tie the hands of the generals on the ground, and you need to leave this up to the experts.

What we have heard tonight is an expert, one of the military's foremost military experts that we are fortunate to have not only in this House of Representatives, but in our freshman class with us.

We heard a strategy for success, and we heard someone who has been there

and seen it firsthand. What struck me was the fact that the President has probably had these discussions, and he has probably had people come to him and offer solutions. Maybe not the identical solutions that Admiral Sestak has, but differences of opinion. And the problem is, this administration has not shown a willingness to listen to differences of opinion.

I talked about it earlier. Generals are reassigned if they come in with a difference of opinion. Public opinion certainly doesn't matter. The facts on the ground certainly don't matter.

I was watching earlier, and I don't know if you had the opportunity to walk through some of the facts of what is going on on the ground in Iraq right now. We hear a lot of things on TV about, is the surge working, is it not working. I will let my colleagues decide.

In November of 2003, the number of insurgents in Iraq was 5,000. That is a pretty high number. In March of 2007, the most recent month for which data is available, there were 70,000 insurgents in Iraq as estimated by the Brookings Institution. So 5,000, 4 years ago; 70,000, today.

The number of multifatality bombings in May of 2004 was 9; in May of 2007, last month, it was 42. To me that does not indicate that we are making progress or there is a light at the end of the tunnel. And the numbers of people killed, both civilian and American servicemen, we talked about that earlier, it is exponentially more now.

Clearly, we need a new direction, and we need people like Admiral Sestak, like anyone who is willing to take a hard look at this and offer an alternative solution, like the Iraq Study Group. This is a group of experts who got together, spent a great deal of time studying this issue, making very thoughtful recommendations to the American people, to the White House, and they were promptly disregarded.

Not only were they disregarded, but the course of action that they recommended, diplomacy with the other actors in the region, a training force rather than an offensive force, these are things that we are going in the exact opposite direction. We didn't just discard it, we have gone opposite to what they recommended.

I would say once again that this discussion is healthy. We have four of us here that have opinions, and there are a lot of opinions, and that is the way it should be. I would agree with the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) that I hope the same type of discussion is taking place on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be the case.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I agree with you, Mr. ALTMIRE. Just the title "admiral" speaks of such respect that we have for Representative SESTAK. Those of us who did not have the privilege of serving in the military, as you can imagine, there are 435 of us on the

floor, we look to each other for advice. We learn from each other.

I know I have spoken to you on a number of occasions to get your advice, to be an informed Member of Congress, and I do appreciate that because I think you not only have that lifetime of experience serving in the military, but as a leader, an admiral in the military, you have the high level of understanding of all the issues we are discussing right now. Of course, it is not the end-all, be-all, but it is a tremendous resource for all of us.

One of the committees that I serve on is Foreign Affairs, and that committee is responsible for working with the President and the State Department on our foreign policy, whether it is in the Western Hemisphere, Hugo Chavez in Venezuela, or in the Middle East or Russia or China.

Our country has been consumed with terrorism since we were attacked on our shores by Osama bin Laden. One of the biggest frustrations we have as Americans, the most powerful nation in the world with the highest level of information and intelligence and reach around the world, the fact that Osama bin Laden is still on the loose is beyond imagination. Every American should demand that that should have been and should continue to be a top priority.

I am pointing that out for a reason. That reason is, we took our eye off the ball when we got involved in this in the first place. That has been discussed and we understand that. But that doesn't mean that today we shouldn't still be focusing on where the real threat is. The threat relates to al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden and his henchmen. The threat relates to nuclear weapons. These are the significant challenges of our day. They are challenges as it relates to Russia and loose nuclear weapons. They are challenges as it relates to North Korea and containing North Korea.

There was an interesting story that Reuters produced. It talked about the estimated number of nuclear weapons that were likely to have been produced by North Korea during the last 6 years of the Bush administration. This is a rogue country by many discussions, by the United Nations and countries around the world, that has a nuclear weapon, possibly seven nuclear weapons that we know of, all within the last 6 years, which tells us once again that we took our eye off the ball of dealing with the true threats.

This is not a question of whether North Korea is going to shoot off an ICBM towards the United States. This is not a stable country and may provide that nuclear weapon to other groups, organizations, countries. That is a threat. That is where our focus should be. Iraq is a different situation.

We take a look at Iran and what we know about Iran at this moment. There are an estimated number of centrifuges in Iran, in their main nuclear facility producing reactor-grade uranium. There may be 1,300 of these

spread out in Iran. Iran is a threat, in having a nuclear weapon, to Israel and to other countries in the Middle East, and for the same reason, to the United States.

This is a serious issue. This is where our foreign policy and military strength and the sharing of intelligence and confidence with other allies around the world, where we have always historically, American Presidents have always led, and we made sure that we had that authority. And it was in our country's best interests.

But today we find ourselves in a place because we are mired in Iraq where many countries around the world are not prepared to share that goal of nuclear containment. This is something that we need to focus on. This is another reason why we have to extricate ourselves in a responsible way from a war that is not achieving our national security interests, and refocus our attention on nuclear weapons that may be developed in Iran, and make sure that we are doing the right thing to protect the American people.

Mr. HODES. Thank you.

Admiral SESTAK, we have a few moments left. I turn it over to you for some of your closing thoughts and then I will wrap up.

Mr. SESTAK. If I may add onto comments made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN), the lack of a strategy of engagement by this administration where it became focused and stuck in Iraq has hurt our security tremendously. We outsourced our leadership during that period of time to others.

North Korea went to China. We gave Iran to the European Union. And I can't tell you who we gave the Middle East to.

Let's step back and look at what has occurred. A conflict in the Middle East where our Secretary of State stopped by for a photo-op and continued down, in the midst of that conflict, to Southeast Asia for a conference.

Iran, bent now upon a nuclear weapon. And North Korea, as you referenced, during that period of time as they called General Powell back, who tried to continue the negotiations that the Clinton administration had left the Bush administration with an agreed framework not to have a nuclear reactor continue to produce fissile material. And a missile moratorium. They now at least have seven more nuclear weapons, if they care to build them.

□ 2145

And they've exploded one of them. And they've broken the missile moratorium and only belatedly have they actually gone back now and agreed to the same agreement that the Clinton administration had.

Iraq is such a tragedy. Iran, when General Ikenberry was leaving, our three-star general from Afghanistan, he was asked, does Iran work toward our interest there? The answer was yes. You want stability in Afghanistan. It doesn't want the Taliban there or al



Qaeda. So we step back and say engage, engage with consequences Iran, Syria, give them a date that we won't be in that state of Iraq and they with Iraqis and Saudis and Jordan must step up so we can be about this world and ensure our security elsewhere. That's what this debate is about.

Mr. HODES. I thank all my colleagues, Mr. SESTAK and Mr. ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania, Mr. KLEIN from Florida. It has been a truly interesting discussion tonight focusing on strategy, the complexity of a world that has changed but which Democrats are facing with boldness and leadership to help take our country and the world in a new direction, to reverse the damage that's been done by the administration and reassert our role as a leader in this world on our principles and our values, not merely our military might but only using our military might in service of the good judgment our leaders exercise in the pursuit of peace.

As we leave for our July 4 recess, I want to leave us with this thought. The Army says that it will leave no soldier behind. And as we discussed here tonight, the Democrats in Congress have committed to leaving no veteran behind. We have voted and passed the biggest increase in Veterans' Administration spending for health care and needed services in this country's history.

The chart I have here shows in dramatic form what has happened over the past few years. From 2003 to 2008, the VA is treating many, many more Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans. We've been in a conflict where our soldiers have been deployed, redeployed, redeployed and redeployed again, two times, three times, four times. Whereas compared to World War II, when their active duty tours were 180 days, they're now seeing 15 months, wreaking havoc on the soldiers and their families at the same time. As General Odom put it today, they're experiencing cataclysmic events every day, new kinds of injuries, polytrauma, traumatic brain injuries, PTSD have created great complexity in our VA system.

So as we go out on July 4, I would ask us all to think about what supporting our troops really means. In my view, supporting our troops means employing and following a course that is a real, smart, strategic effort to protect American security by redeploying our troops from the middle of a civil war in which they don't belong, number one. That is truly supporting our troops, because they are owed the policy that the civilian leaders should be following. That is what our troops are owed and our veterans are owed when they come home, the best that we can give them. No more broken promises from the White House. No more broken promises from the Republicans who have cut the budgets time and time again, who have cut health care in the VA, who have imposed fee increases on our veterans. No more. We will leave no veteran behind. The Democrats promise that. We have followed through on our commitment.

And I am so proud to stand with you all as Members of the 110th Congress to help lead this country in a new direction and be the kind of world leader that the American people expect and deserve.

Thank you very much and good night.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after noon.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a funeral of a war casualty from the district.

Mr. POE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 6:45 p.m. on account of official business.

Mr. GILCHREST (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for June 25 and 26.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. YARMUTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SARBANES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ELLISON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YARMUTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REICHERT, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 179, 110th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 179, 110th Congress, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 10, 2007, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2339. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lactofen; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0178; FRL-8132-9] received June 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2340. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0968; FRL-8135-5] received June 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2341. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Acrylic and Modacrylic Fibers Production, Carbon Black Production, Chemical Manufacturing: Chromium Compounds, Flexible Polyurethane Foam Production and Fabrication, Lead Acid Battery Manufacturing, and Wood Preserving [EPA-HQ-AR-2006-0897; FRL-8330-1] (RIN: 2060-AN44) received June 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2342. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina: Charlotte, Raleigh-Durham, and Winston-Salem Areas Second 10-Year Maintenance Plan for the Carbon Monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard; Clarification [EPA-R04-OAR-2005-NC-0002-200538C; FRL-8328-6] received June 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2343. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report on Audit Policy: Frequently Asked Questions for 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2344. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-61, "Cigarette Stamp Clarification Temporary Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2345. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-62, "District of Columbia School Reform Property Disposition Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2346. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the annual compilation of personal financial disclosure statements and amendments thereto filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, pursuant to rule XXVI, clause 1, of the House Rules; (H. Doc. No. —43); to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and ordered to be printed.

2347. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's March 2007 "Treasury Bulletin," pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, and Agriculture.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANTOS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2420. A bill to declare United States policy on international climate cooperation, to authorize assistance to promote clean and efficient energy technologies



in foreign countries, and to establish the International Clean Energy Foundation; with an amendment (Rept. 110-215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1851. A bill to reform the housing choice voucher program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; with an amendment (Rept. 110-216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1852. A bill to modernize and update the National Housing Act and enable the Federal Housing Administration to use risk-based pricing to more effectively reach underserved borrowers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2894. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the writing of the "Star Spangled Banner" and the War of 1812, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. DENT, Ms. LEE, Mr. RENZI, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 2895. A bill to establish the National Affordable Housing Trust Fund in the Treasury of the United States to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, and preservation of decent, safe, and affordable housing for low-income families; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 2896. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a volunteer teacher advisory committee; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 2897. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a prospective payment system instead of the reasonable cost-based reimbursement method for Medicare-covered services provided by Federally qualified health centers and to expand the scope of such covered services to account for expansions in the scope of services provided by Federally qualified health centers since the inclusion of such services for coverage under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr.

PITTS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mrs. DRAKE):

H.R. 2898. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish standards for impeachment of justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2899. A bill to designate the Department of Veteran Affairs outpatient clinic located at 417 West 4th Avenue in Albany, Georgia, as the "Walter Carl Jordan, Jr. Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GORDON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. BONO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2900. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and for medical devices, to enhance the postmarket authorities of the Food and Drug Administration with respect to the safety of drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 2901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a program demonstrating multiple approaches to Life-long Learning Accounts, which are portable, worker-owned savings accounts that can be used by workers to help finance education, training, and apprenticeships and which are intended to supplement both public and employer-provided education and training resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to double the child tax credit for the first year, to expand the credit dependent care services, to provide relief from the alternative minimum tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WATT, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2903. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for innovative teacher retention programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOEKSTRA,

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. FORTUÑO):

H.R. 2904. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to reauthorize the laws relating to public charter schools to improve academic achievement of all students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SEN-SENRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHAD-EGG, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 2905. A bill to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from repromulgating the fairness doctrine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIRK:

H.R. 2906. A bill to establish a pilot program under which the Secretary of Education makes grants to establish and support the 10th Congressional District of Illinois School Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2907. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a deadline for restricting sewage dumping into the Great Lakes and to fund programs and activities for improving wastewater discharges into the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2908. A bill to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 2909. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for the travel expenses of a taxpayer's spouse who accompanies the taxpayer on business travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.R. 2910. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for reimbursement to members of the Armed Forces of tuition for programs of education delayed by military service, for deferment of students loans and reduced interest rates for members of the Armed Forces during periods of military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 2911. A bill to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to provide similar protections under that Act for consumers as apply under the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2912. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to finalize the proposed rule relating to the reduction of fuel tank flammability exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. KUHL of New York):

H.R. 2913. A bill to amend the administrative requirements for conservation programs administered by the Department of Agriculture to ensure a greater emphasis on increasing habitat for native and managed pollinators and establishing cropping systems, integrated pest management regimes, and other practices to protect native and managed pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 2914. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access of Medicare beneficiaries to immune globulins; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2915. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the National Health Service Corps Scholarship and Loan Repayment Programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2916. A bill to prevent Members of Congress from receiving the automatic pay adjustment scheduled to take effect in 2008; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WYNN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 2917. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to report on measures being taken to inform the public of the transition to digital format television broadcasting; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. STARK, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2918. A bill to permanently prohibit oil and gas leasing off the coast of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 2919. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Virgin Islands Military and Veterans Memorial, to be located in Fredericksted, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 2920. A bill to convey certain submerged lands to the Government of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 2921. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct a study on the feasibility of authorizing the Department of the Treasury to create and issue annuity products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 2922. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BAKER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 2923. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to make a grant to the National D-Day Museum Foundation for facilities and programs of America's National World War II Museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand expenses which qualify for the Hope Scholarship Credit and to make the Hope Scholarship Credit and the Lifetime Learning Credit refundable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. GILLMOR):

H.R. 2925. A bill to provide a grant program for gifted and talented students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WATT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WALSH of New York, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2926. A bill to authorize funds to prevent housing discrimination through the use of nationwide testing, to increase funds for the Fair Housing Initiatives Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 2927. A bill to increase the corporate average fuel economy standards for automobiles, to promote the domestic development and production of advanced technology vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 2928. A bill to provide grants to States to improve high schools and raise graduation rates while ensuring rigorous standards, to develop and implement effective school models for struggling students and dropouts, and to improve State policies to raise graduation rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 2929. A bill to limit the use of funds to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq or to exercise United States economic control of the oil resources of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAHONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2930. A bill to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 to improve the program under such section for supportive housing for the elderly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

H.R. 2931. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for qualified individuals for bone mass measurement (bone density testing) to prevent fractures associated with osteoporosis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McHUGH:

H.R. 2932. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to make cigarettes and certain other tobacco products nonmailable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KIND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. POE, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 2933. A bill to amend the American Battlefield Protection Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 2934. A bill to prevent Members of Congress from receiving the automatic pay adjustment scheduled to take effect in 2008; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas):

H.R. 2935. A bill to extend tax relief to the residents and businesses of an area with respect to which a major disaster has been declared by the President under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (FEMA-1699-DR) by reason of severe storms and tornados beginning on May 4, 2007, and determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under such Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 2936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain improvements to retail space; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that management and administrative activities will not be taken into account in determining if an entity has sufficient business activities in a foreign country to avoid treatment as an expatriated entity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2938. A bill to authorize grants to upgrade agriculture and food sciences facilities at the District of Columbia Land Grant University, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2939. A bill to prohibit the commercial harvesting of Atlantic blackfish in the coastal waters and the exclusive economic zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. KIND, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota):

H.R. 2940. A bill to amend section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to discretionary determinations waiving an alien's inadmissibility based on certain activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PAUL, Mr. McHUGH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. MCCALL of Texas, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 2941. A bill to safeguard the Crime Victims Fund; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2942. A bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LOEBACK, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPACE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. VAN

HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 2943. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of disability rated and certified as total by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as disability for purposes of such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAYS:

H.R. 2944. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the eligibility requirement for disability insurance benefits under which an individual must have 20 quarters of Social Security coverage in the 40 quarters preceding a disability shall not be applicable in the case of a disabled individual suffering from a covered terminal disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2945. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide beneficiary protections against excessive cost-sharing under the Medicare Advantage Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 2946. A bill to amend the accountability provisions of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 2947. A bill to provide for the establishment of energy performance standards for new Federal or federally supported buildings, and major renovations of Federal or federally supported buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 2948. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit health insurance to be purchased from a health savings account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 2949. A bill to authorize grants to the Eurasia Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 2950. A bill to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science and Technology, Education and Labor, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, Small Business, the Judiciary, Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for

consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2951. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the earned income tax credit for single, childless workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should expand trade opportunities with Mongolia by initiating negotiations to enter into a free trade agreement with Mongolia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KILPATRICK (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of African American Bone Marrow Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GOODE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution recognizing and commending all volunteers and other persons who provide support to the families and children of members of the Armed Forces, including National Guard and Reserve personnel, who are deployed in service to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H. Res. 525. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should reaffirm the commitments of the United States to the 2001 Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health and to pursuing trade policies that promote access to affordable medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H. Res. 526. A resolution supporting home ownership and responsible lending; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. WELLER, Mr. STARK, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 527. A resolution recognizing the month of November as "National Homeless Youth Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. SHAYS):

H. Res. 528. A resolution commemorating the 300th anniversary of the Town of New Milford, Connecticut; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WELCH of Vermont:

H. Res. 529. A resolution commending Brigadier General George Stannard and the Second Vermont Brigade upon the 144th anni-

versary of the Battle of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. BERRY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 154: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 156: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 180: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 219: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 241: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 245: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 303: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 396: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 404: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 418: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 450: Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 462: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 468: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 507: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 530: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 549: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 583: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 601: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 621: Mr. HODES and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 642: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 643: Mr. HARE and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 657: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 687: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 697: Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 748: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 758: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 782: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 840: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 864: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 867: Mr. WOLF, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 928: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 957: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DENT, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 971: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

H.R. 1023: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1030: Mr. WATT.

H.R. 1043: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1076: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 1088: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1092: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1102: Mr. SPACE and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1103: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1108: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1110: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1112: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 1113: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1120: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1134: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 1147: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1171: Mr. CLAY and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1177: Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 1178: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1193: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1197: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1211: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1216: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1229: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1267: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 1275: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 1282: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 1304: Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

H.R. 1322: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1338: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SHULER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. BOREN, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1343: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1357: Mr. COBLE, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1381: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1398: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HARE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1399: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1400: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. KELLER, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1415: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1416: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1418: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1419: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1420: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1422: Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. OLIVER, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1428: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1440: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1459: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1464: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HOLT, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1474: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MELANCON, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 1506: Mr. ARCURI, Ms. CASTOR, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1507: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1514: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1532: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1536: Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 1537: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1552: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1560: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 1576: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 1584: Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. HODES.

H.R. 1610: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1629: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1634: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1647: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1665: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1687: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1699: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1705: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1707: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1709: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1761: Mr. POE.

H.R. 1809: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1845: Mr. REYES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. PETRI.  
H.R. 1846: Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 1856: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1871: Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 1872: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 1881: Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 1889: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 1912: Mr. STUPAK.  
H.R. 1927: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
H.R. 1937: Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. NUNES, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. PORTER.  
H.R. 1941: Mr. CUMMINGS.  
H.R. 1943: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
H.R. 1953: Mr. BOREN.  
H.R. 1956: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
H.R. 1957: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 1968: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 1971: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 1983: Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. CASTOR, and Mr. WEXLER.  
H.R. 1990: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.  
H.R. 2015: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. HIGGINS.  
H.R. 2027: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
H.R. 2036: Mr. HARE.  
H.R. 2046: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
H.R. 2053: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.  
H.R. 2054: Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 2060: Mr. GILCHREST.  
H.R. 2069: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2075: Mr. BACA.  
H.R. 2091: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. GILLMOR.  
H.R. 2092: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. ANDREWS.  
H.R. 2102: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DICKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WOLF.  
H.R. 2103: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 2122: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 2123: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 2125: Mr. GILLMOR.  
H.R. 2138: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mrs. BACHMANN.  
H.R. 2149: Mr. ALEXANDER.  
H.R. 2165: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. GONZALEZ.  
H.R. 2216: Ms. CARSON.  
H.R. 2217: Ms. CARSON.  
H.R. 2228: Mr. WOLF.  
H.R. 2231: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. DUNCAN.  
H.R. 2236: Ms. DEGETTE.  
H.R. 2247: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 2255: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.  
H.R. 2265: Ms. HOOLEY.  
H.R. 2274: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. DICKS.  
H.R. 2280: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. PLATTS.  
H.R. 2289: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.  
H.R. 2298: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2312: Mr. BAKER and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2332: Mr. COBLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
H.R. 2342: Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 2353: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Ms. HIRONO.  
H.R. 2361: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
H.R. 2362: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. CROWLEY.  
H.R. 2365: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.  
H.R. 2380: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.  
H.R. 2392: Mr. HARE.  
H.R. 2416: Mr. WELDON of Florida.  
H.R. 2417: Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 2426: Mr. HILL.  
H.R. 2435: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 2438: Mr. BAKER.  
H.R. 2443: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. BOREN.  
H.R. 2447: Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 2458: Mr. ALTMIRE.  
H.R. 2471: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 2504: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
H.R. 2510: Mr. WICKER and Mrs. BACHMANN.  
H.R. 2512: Mr. LAMPSON.  
H.R. 2548: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.  
H.R. 2550: Mrs. DRAKE and Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 2578: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 2588: Mr. WELDON of Florida.  
H.R. 2596: Mr. FILNER, Ms. BEAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 2600: Mr. GOODE, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. ADERHOLT.  
H.R. 2608: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 2609: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. HINOJOSA.  
H.R. 2634: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
H.R. 2639: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H.R. 2659: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, and Mr. PLATTS.  
H.R. 2668: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 2700: Ms. BORDALLO.  
H.R. 2702: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 2707: Mr. FOSSELLA.  
H.R. 2723: Mr. RUSH, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
H.R. 2734: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.  
H.R. 2738: Mr. PENCE.  
H.R. 2743: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
H.R. 2745: Mr. PAUL, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. ALEXANDER.  
H.R. 2746: Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 2750: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. SOLIS.  
H.R. 2758: Mr. HOLT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of Cali-

fornia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. CASTOR.  
H.R. 2762: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BACHUS, and Ms. DELAURO.  
H.R. 2802: Mr. PAUL, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. FARR.  
H.R. 2805: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. GORDON.  
H.R. 2809: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIND, and Mr. CARNAHAN.  
H.R. 2818: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. GONZALEZ.  
H.R. 2821: Mr. HERGER and Mr. JEFFERSON.  
H.R. 2827: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 2831: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
H.R. 2832: Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 2834: Mr. WELCH of Vermont and Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 2840: Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 2842: Mr. CLAY.  
H.R. 2852: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FALBOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.  
H.R. 2857: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HARE, and Ms. CLARKE.  
H.R. 2859: Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 2860: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. HINOJOSA.  
H.R. 2879: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.  
H.R. 2880: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 2892: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.  
H.J. Res. 45: Mr. DONNELLY.  
H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. GORDON.  
H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. SNYDER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H. Con. Res. 136: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.  
H. Con. Res. 139: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
H. Con. Res. 169: Mrs. CAPPS.  
H. Con. Res. 176: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.  
H. Res. 32: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H. Res. 34: Mr. RUSH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H. Res. 37: Ms. LEE and Ms. CASTOR.  
H. Res. 106: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H. Res. 111: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SPACE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. MANZULLO.  
H. Res. 140: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H. Res. 145: Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.  
H. Res. 169: Mr. ALTMIRE.  
H. Res. 208: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. CALLEGLEY.  
H. Res. 231: Mr. BACHUS.  
H. Res. 282: Mr. FOSSELLA and Mrs. DRAKE.  
H. Res. 303: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. PAYNE.  
H. Res. 326: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. SESTAK.  
H. Res. 333: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 338: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Res. 345: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H. Res. 356: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 476: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 489: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H. Res. 493: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCKEON, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 494: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 497: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Res. 499: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. DENT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H. Res. 500: Mr. WICKER and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 506: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 508: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H. Res. 511: Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 515: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WU, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H. Res. 521: Mr. WEINER and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 523: Mr. ROTHMAN.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2720: Mr. REYES.

H. Res. 106: Mr. WICKER.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

91. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Democrats Abroad Munich, Germany, relative to a Resolution strongly supporting a political rather than a military solution to the civil war in Iraq involving a regional diplomatic effort including Iraq's neighbors, as military force cannot be the answer to communal violence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

92. Also, a petition of the Democrats Abroad Munich, Germany, relative to a Resolution calling on the Democratic National Committee to develop a United States Climate Change Policy by 2008 that includes the United States participation in multilateral efforts to slow, stop and reverse the increase of global GHG emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

93. Also, a petition of the Democrats Abroad Munich, Germany, relative to a Resolution calling for a proactive policy on the

part of the United States of America for the renewal of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

94. Also, a petition of the Democrats Abroad Munich, Germany, relative to a Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to impress upon the President of the United States that the current crisis over Iran's enrichment of uranium and its alleged aid and assistance to the insurgency in Iraq should be solved through diplomacy and direct talks with the government of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

95. Also, a petition of the Democrats Abroad Munich, Germany, relative to a Resolution concerning the restoration of habeas corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

96. Also, a petition of the Washington Democratic Town Committee, relative to a Resolution urgently petitioning the Congress of the United States to institute impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States and the Vice President for approving warrantless surveillance of United States citizens in violation of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

97. Also, a petition of the Democratic Party of Arizona, relative to a Resolution calling for an end to the United States presence in Iraq by limiting funding for the war and fully funding the safe and orderly redeployment and withdrawal of all troops from Iraq; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.